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1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROGRAM
1.1 UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION

The University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, serves as the major center of liberal and professional education and as the primary land-grant campus in the state. In addition, it is Arkansas’ major source of theoretical and applied research and the provider of a wide range of public services to people throughout the state and nation. In serving its three-fold mission of teaching, research, and public service, the university strives to be recognized for excellence and continues to expand and strengthen its nationally and regionally competitive programs while maintaining a high level of competence in all programs.

The university offers a broad spectrum of academic programs leading to baccalaureate, master’s, doctoral, and professional degrees, not only in traditional disciplines within arts, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences, but also in the core professional areas of agricultural, food and life sciences; architecture; business; education; engineering; human environmental sciences; and law. Through its faculty and its student body, the campus seeks to have all of its programs regionally competitive and, in addition, to offer nationally competitive programs in selected areas.

The U of A offers 83 bachelor’s degrees in 74 fields of study. In addition, the U of A offers a wide range of graduate degrees, including the Master’s, the Educational Specialist, the Doctor of Education, and the Doctor of Philosophy. Information about graduate programs can be found in the Graduate School Catalog or on the World Wide Web at http://www.uark.edu/depts/gradinfo

The university has statewide responsibility to provide research leadership in advancing the frontiers of knowledge. The research programs serve three primary purposes. First, as part of graduate instruction, research promotes students’ abilities to appreciate and to implement, to discover, and to teach. Second, research programs serve as vital sources of information on the economic and social needs of Arkansas. Third, in selected areas, research on the Fayetteville campus serves a national and international scholarly community. The campus is committed to a future that includes sustained growth in its research and scholarship.

The university provides extensive technical and professional services to varied groups and individuals throughout the state, helping to further Arkansas’ economic growth. In addition, the Fayetteville campus serves as a significant resource to the state. It operates nationally respected high school and college-level correspondence programs; it assists other institutions in developing educational programs; it offers graduate programs, both cooperatively and singly, throughout the state; and it makes specialized campus resources such as computing services and library resources available to other institutions in the state. The campus will continue to serve this unique role and may expand these services to continue providing statewide education through an uplink/downlink network as well as through additional cooperative graduate education programs.

HISTORY
The University of Arkansas was established at Fayetteville in 1871. It opened its doors to students on January 22, 1872. There were few facilities and practically no money for the beginning of that first academic year more than a century ago, but the new institution had a distinct advantage that has been of increasing importance throughout the years.
It was established under provisions of the Morrill Act as both the State University and the Land Grant College of Arkansas. This gave the new university an academic heritage from universities of the past and at the same time bestowed the educational responsibilities in “agriculture and mechanic arts” as envisioned by Senator Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont. The Morrill Act set aside federal land-grant money to help states in their efforts to establish programs of higher education.

The location of Fayetteville for the university was determined by elections held throughout the state for the purpose of voting bonds or subscriptions to establish the university. The largest bid came from the County of Washington and the City of Fayetteville for a combined total of $130,000. To this amount and the Congressional land grant of 150,000 acres, the state added an appropriation of $50,000 for the benefit of the institution. The 160-acre homestead of William McIlroy was selected as the campus site and purchased for $12,000. The McIlroy home was converted into classrooms, and a new, two-story, frame building was constructed with one classroom on each floor.

From a small beginning of eight students and three faculty members on the opening day of classes, the University of Arkansas has developed into a mature institution with eight schools and colleges. It is the major center in Arkansas for graduate-level instruction as well as basic and applied research. In addition, its public service activities reach every county in Arkansas.

Location
All units of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, except those indicated below, are located in Fayetteville, a thriving city in the northwest corner of the state. In the heart of the Ozark Mountains, the city boasts a lively cultural scene and easy access to outdoor recreation. With a population of more than 60,000, Fayetteville was heralded as one of Business Week’s 2002 “Dazzling Dozen” small cities in the U.S. Northwest Arkansas is the sixth-fastest-growing region in the nation, according to the U.S. census, and was recently included among the top four “Best Places for Work” by CNN/Money. The Milken Institute rates the metropolitan economy as the eighth strongest in the country. Fayetteville’s temperate climate ensures beautiful seasons year-long, and it is central to larger metropolitan areas, including Dallas, Kansas City, Little Rock, Memphis, St. Louis, and Tulsa.

ACADEMIC UNITS
The academic units on the Fayetteville campus include ten colleges and schools: the Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences, the School of Architecture, the J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences, the Sam M. Walton College of Business, the College of Education and Health Professions, the College of Engineering, the School of Law, the Honors College, the Graduate School, and the School of Continuing Education and Outreach.

The state office of the Cooperative Extension Service is located in Little Rock. The Division of Agriculture Arkansas Experiment Station operates the Main Station located in Fayetteville; research programs in the Division of Agriculture are also at the University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff; Arkansas State University; the department of forestry at the University of Arkansas, Monticello; four research and extension centers, and at 10 outlying stations.

The University of Arkansas-Fayetteville is accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, 30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400, Chicago, Illinois, 60602-2504.
1.2 INSTITUTIONAL MISSION

The university of Arkansas has adopted the following Vision Statement:

The University of Arkansas is a nationally competitive, student-centered, research university serving Arkansas and the world.

The University has elaborated on the Vision statement with the following:

The university embraces and expands the historic trust inherent in the land-grant philosophy by providing access to academic and professional education, by developing intellectual growth and cultural awareness in its students, and by applying knowledge and research skills to an ever-changing human condition.

This vision is contingent on making progress toward the following five institutional goals:

1. Enhancing diversity among our faculty, students and staff;
2. Strengthening academic quality and reputation by enhancing and developing programs of excellence in teaching, research, and outreach;
3. Increasing the size and quality of our student body;
4. Increasing public financial support, particularly that provided by the state and federal government;
5. Increasing private gift support from alumni, friends, corporations, foundations, and other organizations.

1.3 PROGRAM HISTORY

The Department of Architecture at the University of Arkansas traces its origin to two classes in architecture offered in the 1946-47 academic year, after which it became a five-year program in architectural engineering in the College of Engineering beginning in the following year. Professor John G. Williams was the first instructor in architecture and taught the first classes. He was also the author of the first curriculum in architecture and, eventually, the first chair of the department; he served in that capacity until 1966.

In 1948 the program in architecture became a part of the College of Arts and Sciences. The first degrees in architecture were conferred in 1950, and the professional degree in architecture was first accredited in 1958. It has been continuously accredited since that time.

E. Fay Jones was chosen to succeed Professor Williams as director of the architecture program in 1966, and was appointed the first dean of the newly established School of Architecture in 1974. Emie Jacks (now Professor Emeritus) served as assistant dean and associate dean for many years in this period. Jones was succeeded by Murray Smart in 1977, Daniel Bennett in 1991, and Jeff Shannon as interim dean in 2000, and, following a national search, as dean in 2002. Department heads have been Steve Miller (1983), Geoffrey Baker (1984), Michael Buono (1986), David Buege (1992), Patricia Kucker (2002). Currently serving as department head is Tim de Noble, appointed by Dean Jeff Shannon in August 2005.

Following a year’s service as interim department head, Jeff Shannon was appointed to serve as interim head of the department while also serving as interim dean. He served in both capacities until being named dean in March 2002. He was replaced as interim
department head with the hiring of Patricia Kucker, formerly of the University of Virginia in the fall of 2002. Kucker served in this capacity until the Fall of 2004. During the fall term of the 2004/05 school year, the faculty opted to work by committee in lieu of the dean’s naming a department head. In the spring of the 2004/05 academic year the dean appointed Greg Herman and Steve Luoni as co-chairs of the faculty. In July 2004 Tim de Noble was appointed department head by the dean upon recommendation of the faculty, and continues to serve in this capacity.

1.4 PROGRAM MISSION

Introduction:
The School of Architecture and its departments continue to operate under the Vision 2001 document approved by the faculty in February, 2001 and by the provost of the university in July, 2001. This vision statement was prompted by several local circumstances including substantial changes in school and departmental administration and by the appointment of a new university administrative team including a new chancellor (Summer 1997) and provost (Summer 2000). Though the document is not referred to on a daily basis, the precepts embedded within the document are rooted in admirable intentions, while its goals remain compelling in guiding and organizing our decision making processes.

Vision 2001 contains the following elements: Core Values, Vision Statement, Mission Statement and Goals (shown under “Strategic Plan” below). Also included in this section is a narrative description of our mission.

Core Values
1. We accept and celebrate the land-grant tradition of the University of Arkansas, emphasizing our service to the State through teaching, research and outreach.
2. We believe in the value of diversity in the student body, faculty and staff.
3. We believe in the centrality of ethics, integrity, and personal responsibility among students, faculty and staff.
4. We value tradition as well as innovation and seek to understand their interaction and reciprocation.
5. We believe in preserving and transmitting existing knowledge as well as creating new knowledge through research, scholarship and creative activity.
6. We believe in our students’ need to experience multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary collaborations.
7. We believe in teaching our students to work as part of a design team.
8. We believe in teaching as well as demonstrating to our students responsible civic and social engagement.
9. We believe in teaching critical thinking and problem solving to prepare our students for “lifetime learning.”

Operative Values
In a parallel and more concise manner, enumerated through our website the following operative values, shared by both departments within the School of Architecture:
2. Drawing as a Tool for Seeing Our students clarify design ideas through hand drawing.
3. Diversity Our students strive to shape environments that work for everyone.
4. Teamwork Our students learn the value of collaboration.
5. International study Our students experience diverse cultures first hand.
6. **Outreach** Our students gain real-world experience while serving the community.

7. **Critical thinking** Our students challenge conventions to develop creative solution.

8. **Research** Our students engage in multidisciplinary investigations.

**Vision Statement for the University of Arkansas**

The University of Arkansas is a nationally competitive, student-centered research university serving Arkansas and the world.

**Vision Statement for the School of Architecture**

The School of Architecture will provide nationally recognized, student-centered, professional design programs, incorporating exceptional liberal education opportunities, producing outstanding graduates and making significant contributions to society through research, scholarship, creative activity and service.

**Mission Statement FOR THE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE**

The School of Architecture engages in teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity and service that support the aims and aspirations of our students and the professional development goals of our faculty, staff, and alumni, and serves the diverse needs of the community and society with integrity and clearness of purpose.

**Narrative Mission Statement**

The mission of the Department of Architecture at the University of Arkansas is rooted in the best traditions of architectural education: responsibility and service to the societies and cultures to which we are inextricably connected, and the nurturing of the individual curiosity and capabilities of our students. We enthusiastically embrace the challenges of helping them in developing and refining essential skills, expanding their base of knowledge, sharpening their intellects, and polishing their sensibilities. We hope and trust that they leave us with a profound sense of confidence in themselves, and the conviction and capabilities necessary in dealing with the challenges and uncertainties they will confront in designing human habitat.

The program of the Department of Architecture seeks to balance the requirements, constraints, and challenges of an undergraduate professional education with the necessity for education in the humanities, the arts and the sciences that comprise the intellectual core, the heart, of a university education. By virtue of our place in a land-grant university, our mission is defined in tradition by the broad categories of teaching, service and research, and each of these holds great significance for the architecture discipline. The emphasis placed on each of these three categories, may vary individually and collectively, but each maintains a significant place in our mission and each must find a place in the education of those pursuing careers in architecture and allied professions. Though these pursuits may be diverse (and we acknowledge the desire and necessity for some to explore the periphery of our discipline) we focus our educational efforts on gaining knowledge which serves as a base for intellectual growth and in so doing promotes the innovative, even inventive, application of specialized knowledge in defining and solving architectural problems. For students who wish to enter the architecture profession, we provide preparation for successful internship and for the increasing scope of responsibilities in practice, and we provide the impetus for life-long learning. With ever increasing frequency, our graduates pursue varied careers, both outside of architecture, and in many different roles within. We have designed our
curriculum for the education, not the training of architects. We promote education as the basis of life-long learning and growth, not an a means of attaining immediate rewards. At the center of our efforts is the necessity for understanding and knowledge in the history of architecture and our place in it, in theory and value-based philosophy, and in the range of technologies by which we implement and sustain our interventions in the built environment.

Perhaps more than anytime in recent history, architecture is at the forefront of professions in our society. This is in part due to forces outside of the profession that have succeeded in focusing attention on our urban society, on our relationship with the land, on practices affecting the environment in an increasingly global society, and on the potency of architects as leaders and consensus builders. In line with this sea-change, we acknowledge the need for self-reflection and for intelligence and responsiveness in the face of the ever-present scrutiny of the people and institutions served by architecture, and by architects. This leads us to an ongoing, open-ended critical evaluation of the nature of the responsibilities to (and in) each facet of the tripartite, land-grant institutional mission.

Ours is a design-oriented program. While we acknowledge that not all of our graduates will be designers nor are they bound to traditional definitions of architectural practice, we are unapologetic in advocating the significance of design as a necessary endeavor of our society and of the potency inherent in participation within the collaborative environment of the studio. To quote Walter Gropius, “Our guiding principle is that design is simply an integral part of the stuff of life, necessary for everyone in a civilized society.”

We encourage our students to develop high aspirations for the environments that they, as architects, will transform, create and inhabit. We work to instill an ethic of stewardship, based in the underlying and enduring principles of good urbanism, for the fabric of our towns and cities, and for the physics of buildings and the spirit of architecture; for the architecture of landscape, and for sustaining the natural world. We encourage our students to rediscover the best of the principles we have lost from the work of those who preceded them, and to invent models that will effectively anticipate future conditions and continuing needs for healthy and satisfying human environments. We have focused our attention on real problems, addressing issues rooted in the reality of the world as we find it and the communities we serve. We educate our students to search for, and test better, plausible models for an architecture and profession of consequence and integrity.
1.5 PROGRAM SELF-ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

The faculty and staff at the Department of Architecture engage in a continuing and open-ended process of self assessment through the direct appraisal of our activities, through compilation of statistics produced for the University of Arkansas Academic Policy Series Reports, and through periodic responses to accrediting agencies such as NAAB and the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

Our VISION 2001 is constructed to address the needs of our various constituencies, to respond to the critique of the profession embodied in the Boyer Mitgang report and to incorporate a structure for action in response to accrediting authorities. Although VISION 2001 was formulated as a school-wide initiative, the imbedded precepts are intentionally broad enough to be applicable to each of the departments within the school. In this way the goals enumerated in the document serve to organize the multivalent activities of the Department of Architecture and to provide a framework for sustained self-critique of our performance relative to our mission.

VISION 2001 GOALS

1. To identify and develop focused areas of excellence for each program in the school.
2. To attract and retain diverse students, faculty and staff of the highest possible quality.
3. To create an outstanding “climate for learning,” working where appropriate to correct design education’s historical tendencies “to breed excessive competition, ego inflation, poor physical and emotional maintenance, insecurity and procrastination.” (Citations from Boyer Report)
4. To continue the development of our international programs and study opportunities.
5. To promote, support and disseminate the faculty’s research, scholarship, creative activity and service.
6. To provide our students with a strong foundation of liberal education to support and enhance their professional education.
7. To develop a positive, reciprocal educational partnership with the design professions and allied disciplines.
8. To build our library and other educational support resources to a level that allows us to achieve our diverse academic and professional goals.
9. To help develop the resources to renovate Vol Walker Hall, including an addition to accommodate the growth of our existing programs as well as the development of any new programs.
10. To continue development efforts to endow the School with the permanent resources necessary to achieve our collective ambitions.
11. To be responsive to changing socio-cultural and professional forces affecting the currency and relevance of our educational programs.
12. To regularly reassess our curricula and to revise them as necessary to achieve program objectives and to maintain professional accreditation.
13. To develop and enhance the collaborative educational relationships between Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Garvan Woodland Garden, and The Community Design Center.
14. To expand the department’s outreach initiatives.
PROGRESS TOWARDS VISION 2001 GOALS

1. To identify and develop focused areas of excellence for each program in the school.

Recognizing the strengths of the program including International Study, the Community Design Center, design/build activities, and faculty-directed student research, we continue to study ways to adjust and restructure the curriculum to support greater choice and the potential for academic concentration by our students. We are currently weighing the possibility of restructuring the 5th year to accommodate a number of learning scenarios or setting for our students in line with their intended post-graduate trajectory, including graduate study, practice, and public service, to name a few. In parallel we continue to identify our program’s strengths as potential bases for the establishment of graduate programs serving a greater range of constituencies in the region.

2. To attract and retain diverse students, faculty and staff of the highest possible quality.

- The transition for all high school students studying architecture and landscape architecture can be a difficult one. In addition to confronting the academic and social challenges of university life, they must also acclimate to, and cope with, the rigors of pre-professional training and a demanding studio culture. This adjustment is equally challenging for transfer and non-traditional students. We still believe that the uniqueness of our academic units demands a program specifically designed for our students.

- Beginning in 2003 we have appointed selected 4th and 5th year students to serve as teaching assistants in the first year architecture design studio. The teaching assistants not only served as critics on assignments, but also served the first year students as mentors who are readily available to talk to students about any issues that they face in the architecture department curriculum and beyond. This proved to be very successful, as our new students felt automatically connected to the upper level studios by virtue of having them as teaching assistants. We are now shifting these assistants to the new Leadership by Design course where they will continue in their role as mentors and, being joined by teaching assistants from Landscape Architecture, will promote cross-disciplinary interchange.

- The FYE or First Year Experience classes have been an important component in retaining students. Our FYE courses cover all of the topics that are universal across campus, as well as, intra-school related issues with studio culture and career opportunities. Stress and health management are ever-present topics. We are retooling the FYE as the new Leadership By Design program to begin in the fall of 2007. (See 3.5 Studio Culture)

- Implemented a Diversity Plan, in line with the goals of the university, submitted by the dean to the faculty and upper administration in the Spring of 2007. (See Appendix A)

- The school has added 2 minority-based scholarships for incoming freshmen, as well as $15,000 in Dean’s Circle scholarships to support minority students in our program.

- Implemented a diversity plan, in line with the goals of the university, submitted by the dean to the faculty and upper administration in the
Spring of 2007 (See Appendix). Ted Landsmark, ACSA President, said of our diversity plan, “The University of Arkansas’s architecture program has developed a thoughtful and comprehensive diversity initiative to attract a wider range of students and faculty.”

- Participated through presentations to Upward Bound students over the past 3 academic years. This program is aimed at potential students from families without a college graduate and includes a great number of minority students.
- The department head has served on the board of the Springdale Architecture and Engineering Academy, assisting the faculty in organizing assignments and trips as a part of the academy’s educational endeavors. This academy has numerous college-bound minority students participating in it every year.
- In spring 2008 we will offer a pilot course, “Introduction to Architecture and Landscape Architecture”, at Mid-South Community College in West Memphis, Arkansas. The director of a large architecture firm in Memphis, and alumnus of our program, will coordinate the course. The course is offered as an experiment in recruiting students from the Arkansas Delta.
- Hired, with tenure, an African-American faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor in the Fall of 2005.
- A member of our faculty organized the University’s African-American Studies Lecture Series in the 2005/06 academic year. The series focused on issues of race and architecture.
- A member of our faculty holds a joint appointment in the African American studies program of the Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences.
- In response to increasing numbers of students and potential students of Hispanic descent, our John G. Williams Visiting Professor during the Fall semester of 2006 was Javier Sanchez, Architect of Higuera + Sanchez of Mexico City, a firm specializing in design, development, and construction of housing and multi-use projects, primarily in Mexico.
- The School of Architecture was one of the primary sponsors of the 2006 and 2007 Recommitment Banquet, an annual event honoring the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. Darell Fields delivered one of the three University Lectures held during the weeklong celebration.
- Dean Shannon chaired the University’s Martin Luther King Planning Committee from 2005-2007.
- Our advising center has developed an information sheet for high school academic counselors intended to help them better advise students in preparation for entering an architecture program. Staff from the advising center also meets with counselors on campus and at their schools.

3. To create an outstanding “climate for learning,” working where appropriate to correct design education’s historical tendencies “to breed excessive competition, ego inflation, poor physical and emotional maintenance, insecurity and procrastination.” (Citations from Boyer Report)

Beginning in the spring of 2005, the dean, in response to the NAAB Studio Culture imperative, organized a process of self-reflection relative to the studio environment with the working title of the ‘Dillion Initiative’ intended as a forum for the faculty and administration to focus and reflect on our student’s physical and emotional well-being, as well as on new empirical research in teaching and learning methods. After those initial workshops, a committee of

---

faculty was formed to develop an expanded version of the First Year Experience course. A student advisory board was formed to provide students a voice in this new initiative. In the Fall Semester of 2007, under the direction of Associate Professor of Architecture Laura Terry and Associate Professor of Landscape Architecture Judy Brittenum, the new course, entitled “Leadership by Design,” will be implemented. The course serves all first year students in architecture and landscape architecture and focuses on four areas of knowledge: body and mind, communication, service and leadership. The course also uses upper level mentors to facilitate small group discussions and activities. Over the next four years this initiative will be progressively implemented until it has a presence in all years. To our knowledge, this is the first such comprehensive plan in any school of architecture.

Another significant change was made to the first year curriculum in response to the studio culture report. The first year studio course was reduced from 5 credit hours to 4 credit hours and the previous 1 credit hour Introduction to Architecture course was changed to a 2 credit hour “Design Methods” course, intended to complement the studio more directly. The primary reason for this change was to reduce the number of studio credit hours and shift those hours to a lecture course format. The intention of the shift is to transition students into the studio culture while allowing them to succeed in a more traditional learning environment. Aimed at predicting later student success, criteria for continuing into the program have also been added to the first year in an effort to support building a solid foundation in the beginning year.

4. To continue the development of our international programs and study opportunities.
   - Form relationships with other architecture programs in the United States seeking international study opportunities for their students. On-going.
   - Study the possibility of expanded or alternative programs including graduate study and pre-professional programs. On-going.
   - Continue to seek cooperative agreements allowing students from universities located in Rome and Mexico City to participate in our program at home or abroad. On-going.
   - Study the continued expansion of these programs to include cross-disciplinary activities and opportunities. On-going.

5. To promote, support and disseminate the faculty’s research, scholarship, creative activity and service.
   - Funding research accounts for full-time faculty. On-going.
   - Continuing to make merit based annual pay raises. On-going.
   - Continuing to support all faculty travel to deliver refereed papers. On-going.
   - Continue supporting continuing education opportunities for licensed professionals. On-going.
   - Continuing to negotiate faculty release time for research and creative activity as appropriate. On-going
   - Continuing to support off-campus duty assignments on a rotating basis. On-going.
   - Continuing to support the university’s faculty research journal. On-going.
   - Fund a school research publication and develop ties to the University of Arkansas Press. First publication Fall 2007. On-going.
• Continuing financial support for faculty awards for research and creative activity. On-going.

6. To provide our students with a strong foundation of liberal education to support and enhance their professional education.
• Identify ways to enhance the general education/liberal education component of the architecture curriculum. Currently a senior faculty member serves on the University's General Education Core Committee. On-going.
• The School of Architecture has submitted a proposal for a new General Education Core class entitled, Diversity and Design.
• Implemented a new Honors program in parallel to the creation of the new undergraduate Honors College, funded by gifts from the Campaign for the 21st Century. (see 3.7 Human Resource Development)
• Adjusting the curriculum to allow a greater range of choice in support of minor concentrations and participation in the Honors program. On-going.
• Continuing to explore collaborative educational relationships with academic units outside the Department of Architecture, particularly through funded initiatives in the Honors College for cross disciplinary undergraduate courses and research. On-going.
• Continuing to study the possibility of creating a graduate program in the Department of Architecture as a parallel degree structure to our current 5 year undergraduate degree. On-going.

7. To develop a positive, reciprocal educational partnership with the design professions and allied disciplines.
• Continuing to utilize the Professional Advisory Board and the Dean’s Circle to enhance these relationships. On-going. (See Appendix B)
• Convened a Vendors’ Taskforce charged with advising and development efforts in support of the Design/Build Initiative and developing a materials laboratory. 2007, on-going
• Funding faculty participation in Professional Society meetings. On-going.
• Coordinating efforts between the Arkansas AIA and the School of Architecture AIAS Chapter including student attendance to the State Convention, lectures, and seminars. On-going

8. To build our library and other educational support resources to a level that allows us to achieve our diverse academic and professional goals.
• Increasing the proportion of support from our Annual Fund dedicated to these resources. Several campaign gifts, including that of the dean’s family, have gone to support these areas. On-going.
• Maintaining the level of support for these resources in our “Strategic Objectives” for fundraising, especially emphasizing the journal and periodical collections at the library in the face of increased expense for these resources. On-going.
• Targeting fundraising proposals to address specific physical and education initiatives within the department, including the Design/Build Initiative, the materials lab, and technology needs. A recent example, the Shollmier gift, went to renovate Room 103 (now Shollmier Lecture Hall). The interest on the remainder of the gift will be used to support the media center. A portion of the Paul Young gallery-naming gift will also support these areas. On-going.
• A member of the faculty serves as the school representative to the library and accordingly represents the school and department in matters regarding acquisitions, schedules, and course reserves. On-going.

9. To help develop the resources to renovate Vol Walker Hall, including an addition to accommodate the growth of our existing programs as well as the development of any new programs.

• The goal of consolidation and growth is currently under reconsideration by the dean, department heads and faculty in both programs, and the staff of the CDC. In the main we have re-evaluated our desire for a new building, realizing both the qualities of our current facilities, including its beauty, central location and the potential for addition.

• Facilitating a successful Capital Campaign. Fall 2001 – Summer 2004. Our campaign goal was $10M; over $20M was raised.

• We continue to pursue possible support from the Don W. Reynolds Foundation, even though they do not currently support universities. We maintain our relationship to Steve Anderson, alumnus of the School of Architecture and president of the Foundation, in hopes their policy will change. The dean periodically “makes the case” to university administration for priority funding related to legislative request to be made by the University. This prioritization usually follows the receipt of significant private funding by the academic unit itself.

• Continuing to develop strategies for passing state legislation to fund higher education in the building industry as an additional funding source. This initiative was not successful, despite the support of Senator Bisbe, who authored the bill, and the professional bodies in architecture, landscape architecture, interior design and contracting. Lack of support by the state licensing board for engineering derailed the effort. The steering committee formed to investigate opportunities for collaboration between actors in the building process continues to work with the dean toward its goals.

• Studying and verifying the composition and massing suitability of the proposal to build a new school of architecture as part of the Fine Arts Center. Summer 2001 - This study was undertaken by our Community Design Center. The study revealed clearly that the addition of an “architecture tower” would overwhelm the scale of the existing Ed Stone Building. As a result this particular multidisciplinary initiative was dropped. A decision has been made to remain in Vol Walker Hall and to satisfy any additional space needs through a modest addition to the west side of that building.

• Studying the potential of an addition to and remodeling of Vol Walker Hall, upon realizing that the Fine Arts Proposal was not viable. A local architectural firm was hired to conduct a massing and organizational study during spring 2007. The study confirmed the viability of a 25,000 square foot addition, including improved accessibility, on the west side of Vol Walker Hall in terms of contextual and programmatic constraints and opportunities.

• Vol Walker Hall has heating, ventilating and air conditioning problems, wiring problems, suffers water leakage in the basement, and has acoustical problems that undermine the use of many of our public review spaces. Lecture and classroom facilities are adequate, with projection equipment having been recently upgraded. The school suffers from not
having a single space in the building that can accommodate our entire student body. In fact we are almost 270 seats short; i.e. we can only seat about 34% of our student body. It is therefore often necessary to schedule major public lectures in other nearby campus buildings. On an annual basis, we continue to make known our facility and space needs to the upper administration. They recognize a major renovation of the building is very much needed and is on their high priority list for renovation. However, there is neither a definitive time table nor a funding commitment that we are aware of for launching a major renovation. In the meantime, the dean and development director of the School of Architecture are proceeding with the planning of a fundraising initiative to be launched as early as fall 2007 to develop funding to assist in renovation and/or to help fund a modest to Vol Walker Hall. (See Appendix C)

10. To continue development efforts to endow the school with the permanent resources necessary to achieve our collective ambitions.
   - Organizing a strong campaign committee and providing them with the resources to successfully raise our goal of $10,000,000. Fall 2001 – Summer 2004. The campaign achieved over $20,000,000, twice the campaign goal amount.
   - Identifying 150 potential major donors with interest in the school’s projects and programs. Spring 2001 - Spring 2002. Completed, though we continue to develop this list for subsequent development projects.
   - Informing faculty, staff, and emeritus faculty of the potential impact of a successful capital campaign. The faculty, staff and students were kept informed during and after the conclusion of the campaign.
   - Increasing the number of personal contacts and proposals made and delivered by staff and volunteers. Spring 2001 – Summer 2004. On-going.
   - Informing all alumni and friends about fundraising successes through regular publications and special events. On-going.

11. To be responsive to changing socio-cultural and professional forces affecting the currency and relevance of our educational programs.
   - Utilizing the Professional Advisory Board meetings to help identify and discuss these forces. On-going.
   - Continuing to support and enhance the school’s Visiting Lectures Program. On-going.
   - Continuing the practice of maintaining two to three visiting faculty positions annually. On-going.
   - Continuing to develop and endow teaching “chairs” enabling special visiting professors participation in the department. On-going.
   - Studying the potential of academic “short courses” to identify short term visitors who study these various forces and conditions. On-going.
   - Continuing to support the annual “Spring Review.” On-going.
   - Continuing to support the frequent use of external critics for studio reviews. On-going.
   - Continuing to encourage class field trips. On-going.
   - Continuing to bring in traveling exhibits of relevant work. On-going.
   - Maximizing the utilization of the larger university faculty as resources in dealing with these forces. On-going.
12. To regularly reassess our curricula and to revise them as necessary to achieve program objectives and to maintain professional accreditation.

- Conducting a “Re-Vision” effort beginning at the school level involving students, faculty, staff and advisory board members every three years. Fall 2007.
- Reviewing and revising Vision 2001 periodically or in response to significant changes in the profession or academic environment. Fall 2007.
- Assessing the architecture curriculum every three years. As per university academic policy, students complete questionnaires prior to graduation. These are being followed up with web-based questionnaires submitted by graduates in the first years out of school. On-going.
- Continuing the department’s tradition of emphasizing history as a critically important foundation for designing and assessing the built and natural environments and for forging an integral relationship between professional and liberal education. On-going.
- Maintaining currency in contemporary design theories and to encourage both faculty and students to engage critically in the debates they foster. On-going.
- Addressing a gap in our curriculum, we added a required course on architectural theory. Spring 2007.
- Developing and incorporating into our curricula an understanding of the implications of new information technologies on design education and professional practice. On-going.
- Recognizing and incorporating into our curricula emerging technologies of construction. On-going.
- Recognizing and incorporating into our curricula knowledge about the preservation and productive use of our shrinking reservoir of historical resources. On-going.
- Recognizing and incorporating into our curriculum knowledge about the range of increasingly critical natural environmental issues, including sustainability. On-going.

13. To develop and enhance the collaborative educational relationships between Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Garvan Woodland Garden, and the Community Design Center.

- Encouraging the landscape faculty to send their students to the Rome Study Center. Landscape Architecture students and faculty attend the Rome Study Center during their summer travel experience. During this period they have participated in a number of design workshops organized by the Rome Study Center. On-going.
- Continuing to encourage and support upper-level studio collaborations between architecture and landscape architecture. Some Landscape Architecture faculty members serve as consultants in the Comprehensive Design Studio. The dean funds, through vetted grant proposals, the development of cross-disciplinary courses in Landscape Architecture and Architecture. On-going.
- Continuing to support the Community Design Center as a multidisciplinary design studio option. The School of Architecture and the Department continue to provide financial support for their initiatives as well as funding for attendance at conferences. On-going.

14. To Expand the Department’s Outreach Initiatives.
- Coordination with a manufactured housing company to build and produce a house for the Community Development Corporation, Summer, 2003.
- Co-organized and hosted the Arkansas Summit, a symposium of the New Orleans Charter, formed to organize responses and activities by numerous schools and allied outreach agencies in addressing issues and opportunities for student involvement in post-Katrina New Orleans.
- Continuing to develop opportunities and funding for design-build activities including the Post-Katrina New Orleans project for Girt Town and an initiative to develop a Design/Build Center in the spirit of the outreach mission of our Community Design Center.
- Continue to work with area school districts to sponsor and assist faculty with organizing gifted and talented programs focused on the design profession.
- Develop the Design/Build Initiative as an effective and consistent avenue for outreach activities.
2. PROGRESS SINCE THE LAST SITE VISIT
2.1 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO TEAM FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION
Our faculty have continued to improve the quality of our architectural education and in so doing have addressed issues of concern raised in our 2002 accreditation visit. In addition to curricular adjustments, we have instituted administrative policy changes and initiatives in order to keep pace with changes in the accreditation requirements and with the changing nature of our profession. Given below in italic type are verbatim comments from various sections of the VTR ‘02 that described a deficiency, a concern or a recommendation. Our responses are given below each comment.

Responses to Conditions Not Met
Condition 4: Social Equity

Social equity continues to be a problem. The university and the School of Architecture have clear and positive strategic plans for increasing diversity; however, implementation has not been successful. While the program’s initiative in the Arkansas delta area shows promise, additional initiatives should include goals of diversity in global and multi-ethnic terms. The Mexico studio provides an opportunity to reflect the rising concentration of the region’s Hispanic population.

Response
The school has implemented a Diversity Plan, in line with the goals of the university, submitted by the dean to the faculty and upper administration in the Spring of 2007. (See Appendix). The Diversity Plan is an outline of activities, initiatives, and proposed funding through 2010. We, like most schools of architecture, have sought to diversify our faculty and, again like most, have had limited success. Recognizing that in order to attract a more diverse pool of faculty we must first achieve a diverse student body, we have increased the number of scholarships aimed at attracting minority students and have increased recruiting activities, particularly at area high schools with high concentrations of Latin-American students. We have also appointed highly qualified minority candidates to fill our visiting professor positions. We have built upon our presence in Mexico to attract numerous critics, speakers, and visiting professors of Latin descent in hopes of increasing exposure of our students to mentors of similar heritage. In the end we believe that maintaining a program of distinction will attract qualified, diverse applicants, particularly as the socio-economic climate of the region continues to change and become more diverse as it has seemingly begun to do with the rise of multinational business in the area.

Professor Darell Fields, a senior-level African American faculty member joined our ranks in 2005. Previous to joining the faculty, Professor Fields had served as a Visiting Professor in the 2003/04 academic year. Professor Fields, in addition to teaching within the department’s design studios, was in charge of the university’s African-American Studies Lecture Series in the 2006/07 academic year. The series focused on issues of race and architecture. Additionally Professor Fields teaches a course in the African American Studies program each spring. This course is open to Honors students in the School of Architecture.

In part as a response of our region’s changing demographics we selected Javier Sanchez, Architect of Higuera + Sanchez of Mexico City as our John G. Williams Visiting Professor during the Fall semester 2005. Sanchez’s firm specializes in design, development, and construction of housing and multi-use projects.
For the 2006/2007 academic year we have added two female visiting studio teachers, one of Asian-American descent and one of Serbian descent. In addition we have hired an Associate level female faculty member of Finnish descent.

The School of Architecture was one of the primary sponsors of the 2006 and 2007 Recommitment Banquet, an annual event honoring the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Professor Darell Fields delivered one of the three University Lectures held during the weeklong 2006 celebration. Ted Landsmark (Boston Architectural College, ACSA President) delivered one of the University Lectures in Vol Walker Hall during the 2007 celebration.

Associate Professor Beth Tauke, (University of Buffalo) delivered a lecture in Vol Walker Hall on her renowned course, Diversity in Design in the spring of 2007. The lecture was attended by faculty, staff, students, and members of the University’s Diversity Task Force, including the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

In recognition of the continuing rise in the region’s Hispanic population, we conducted a Symposium entitled Mexican Modernism; Architecture of the Mid-Twentieth Century. Participating in the symposium were three influential architects from Mexico City, including Miquel Adria, editor of Arquime, perhaps the most influential architectural periodical in Mexico. Issues addressed included the rich tradition of modernism in Mexico, its continuing presence, and the challenges architects must confront in a city of 20 million persons. The symposium was well advertised through email announcements, the university and school websites, lecture series posters, and post card mailings to other universities, local schools, and professionals.

Beginning in the spring of 2007, we will sponsor a course in architecture and landscape architecture at Mid-South Community College in West Memphis in coordination with Dr. Glen Fenter, President and Patrick Magruder, architect, alumnus and a member of our Professional Advisory Board. The purpose of this course is to introduce the design professions to students in this primarily African American delta community.

The department head and first-year faculty representatives regularly participate in the university’s Upward Bound and other programs aimed at pre-college students with high academic standing. A number of these programs are aimed specifically at students from families without college degrees, the majority of which tend to be from underrepresented groups.

In addition to participating, along with our advising and admission staff in college fairs at area high schools, the department head serves on the Springdale High School Architecture and Engineering Academy Advisory Board. The academy offers education opportunities for students to engage in college preparatory activities. Springdale High School has a very high concentration of Hispanic students, an ever increasing number of whom participate in the academy. We have been successful in attracting a number of these students to our program in recent years.
The Dean’s Circle, a support group comprised of business leaders and alumni dedicated $15,000.00 in annual need-based scholarship monies to be used in recruiting and retaining students from underrepresented communities.

**Condition 7: Physical Resources**

The visiting team was surprised to find no mention of serious physical facility deficiencies in previous team reports. The beloved Vol Walker Hall is a handsome building and has a long tradition as the home of the Arkansas architecture program. A feasibility study has concluded that the university must either build a new architecture facility or undergo a major addition and remodeling to meet intended enrollment and program initiatives. Numerous life safety and accessibility deficiencies were identified in the study. It is the opinion of the visiting team that the deficiencies are serious to the extent that they must be corrected prior to determining the building’s future use. Required life safety exit and ADA accessibility corrections are necessary whatever the future use of the building...

**Response**

December 2005 marked the completion of the construction work inside and outside of Vol Walker Hall. Funded in large part by over $3M in grants from the Arkansas Natural and Cultural Resources Council and in part by the university, the renovation included new roofing and waterproofing, skylights repair, exterior stone cleaning and joint repair, the addition of 1500 square feet of new studio space and another 1500 square feet for six new faculty offices, and code compliance work. The code compliance work, responding directly to our 2002 NAAB Team Report, included the addition of three major fire stairs, new security and fire alarms as well as several other smaller code-related modifications. The project architect was John K. Mott, FAIA, U of A BArch. ’60, a principal with the Washington, D.C. firm of John Milner Associates, Inc. The architectural drawings documenting these interior changes and additions are included in the appendix of this document.

The code compliance remediation was designed to service the existing building as well as the likelihood of future additions, necessary to accommodate expanded programs, interdisciplinary activities, and changes in teaching and research technologies. One obvious shortcoming of the remodel in need of attention was the failure to replace the original elevator. Allegedly the oldest Otis lift in the state, it does not meet code, is in constant need of repair, and is difficult to access from the primary public areas of the building. It is a significant deterrent for students, faculty, and staff with mobility limitations. In recent years we have had to schedule some activities in other venues, including our career fair, due to this limitation.

**Condition 12.28: Technical Documentation**

The team observed a great amount of craft to delineate systems in model and graphic form. However, the team found insufficient evidence that knowledge gained from the study and delineation of buildings and systems translated into the required ability to prepare documentation of a proposed design for purposes of review and construction.
RESPONSE

In part as a response to this critique we have retooled our technology sequence, including the shifting of content, and replacing a lecture course with a studio focused on building technologies.

Beginning in 2003 we redirected the focus of the Tech V (Arc 4154) to include expanded attention to technical documentation. The course utilizes the case-study method to introduce students to buildings employing superlative examples of wall/building systems resolution and integration. In a sense these might be referred to as advanced building systems in that they eclipse the typical. Working in two person teams, students explore, and/or postulate the details of the modern building under study through U.S. drawing standards and conventions. Particular attention is paid to the building envelope as it is such an integral part of modernism’s response to the physical and social environment. Following this ‘forensic’ exercise, and in parallel with the continuing lecture content of the course, the student teams design an addition to the case-study building, once again utilizing conventional technical documentation to convey their solutions. The intent of this course and its parallel exercises and case-study presentations, is to promote the representation of constructional and technological relationships while helping students to understand the aesthetic potency of the modern assembly.

The second semester studio in the third year, ARC 3026, has been refocused as a Technology Studio, replacing the Tech IV class, which relied primarily on lectures to convey content. The intent of this shift is to promote students’ ability to design and employ building systems in the context of the speculative studio. The purpose for this is twofold: to offer the mid-career design student the opportunity to more speculatively explore the opportunities for building materials, building systems, and construction technologies to inform decisions of form and space in architecture; and to develop in the student a deeper awareness of the physical criteria for buildings in the service of human habitation as well as a level of technical dexterity in the service of architectural production.

Like so many programs we have been dismayed by the established division of technology courses and design studios by “compartmentalizing” the knowledge garnered from each, if for no other reason than the desire to control and manage their course load each semester. From the faculty perspective, the premium placed on student energies toward the design studio, coupled with the classroom format of technology courses tends to promote limits on the speculative content of tech assignments, which can lead to further segregation of information within the course itself. On the contrary, the opportunity for greater technical speculation, to ‘discover’ principals of building technology through ‘acts of making’ in a studio environment, avoiding the compartmenting tendency of a separate support course, are logical outcomes of a technology / studio integration.

The first iteration of this studio occurred in the spring of 2007 and was, by most measures, extremely successful in achieving our goals. It was an opportunity for the students to investigate, and represent, exemplars of modernism through highly articulated representations of wall/structure assemblies, and to learn from those investigations of other students. The students then engaged in the speculative design of their own projects, ultimately using the knowledge and skills
garnered in the initial investigations in designing and representing their ability to address technological issues in their own designs.

In addition to these courses students are introduced to the MasterSpec in the contract documents portion of the Professional Practice class.

In the case of the Tech Studio and the Tech V course, we endeavored to avoid the mere promotion of the ‘typical’ as is so often the case in the presentation of technology. Rather it was our intent to convey and promote the incredible range of invention, necessitated by the evolving demands of technology and sustainability, evident in the design of meaningful and potent architectures of our time.

**CONDITION 12.29 COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN**

The accreditation team shares the faculty and student enthusiasm for the curriculum’s addition of the “Comprehensive Studio”. The University of Arkansas’ Comprehensive Studio expands NAAB’s intent and definition of “comprehensive design” by incorporating invention, innovation and a deeper understanding of design process within the studio. However, the exhibited studio projects failed to demonstrate the ability of each student to produce an architectural project with detailed development of all the required elements of the comprehensive design criteria.

**Response**

We continue to modify the methods of instruction and introduction of environmental systems in the Comprehensive Design Studio (1st semester of 5th year) through its co-requisite, Tech VI, as initially described in the June 2004 report. In addition the faculty passed a curriculum change, implemented for the first time in the 2006/2007 school year which includes the earlier introduction of environmental systems material (now in Tech III, 1st semester of the 3rd year) and the shift of content from the classroom (elimination of Tech IV) to the studio environment, redefinition and focus shift of the 2nd semester the 3rd Year studio toward a technology focus. (See Sample Curriculum in Section 3.11).

Among the most significant modifications has been the addition of Dr. Tahar Messadi, who specializes in environmental analysis, to the faculty. Dr. Messadi is assigned, along with another faculty member, to the co-requisite Tech VI class. His focus on environmental issues, including human comfort and sustainability, has enabled students to conduct more thorough investigations of the technological aspects of their comprehensive projects. In addition, as in the past, professionals are called in to meet with the students and consult them in the formulation of their designs, with particular attention to the materials and building systems to be used in their projects. The Capital Campaign developed a $100,000 gift that, when fully funded, will support bringing relevant professional guests as consultants in the technology courses.

In addition the faculty passed a curriculum change, implemented for the first time in the 2006/2007 school year which includes the earlier introduction of environmental systems material (now in Tech III, 1st semester of the 3rd year) and the shift of content from the classroom (elimination of Tech IV) to the studio environment, redefinition and focus shift of the 2nd semester the 3rd Year studio toward a technology focus. These curriculum adjustments are intended to better prepare the students for the rigors of the advanced studio experience and for the
intensity of building systems investigation and design associated with comprehensive design. By introducing material earlier in the curriculum, studio faculty are afforded the opportunity to construct exercises demanding a degree of comprehensiveness at each level of the design curriculum, rather than creating an anomaly by deferring the experience to the twilight of their time in our program.

RESPONSES TO CAUSES OF CONCERN

Faculty salaries are below national averages and appear to be $8,000 to $10,000 below University of Arkansas averages.

Response

Faculty Salaries Compared to Peers, 2005-2006 Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UASOA</td>
<td>$72,967</td>
<td>$63,426</td>
<td>$51,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National (CUPA-HR)</td>
<td>$85,955</td>
<td>$67,156</td>
<td>$53,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$12,988&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$3730&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$2108&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Peers (NAAB)</td>
<td>$85,437</td>
<td>$65,053</td>
<td>$52,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$12,470&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$1627&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$1042&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of A Peers (UA Institut. Res.)</td>
<td>$90,400</td>
<td>$66,200</td>
<td>$56,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$17,433&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$2774&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$5286&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCES (College and University Professional Administrators)
(National Architecture Accrediting Board)
(University of Arkansas Institutional Research)

Faculty salaries remain below regional and national peer averages and are even further below University of Arkansas averages for salary-by-rank. The table above documents these differences for academic year 2005-2006. The greatest discrepancy occurs on our own campus, where our professors are on average $17,433 below campus peers, associate professors are $2774 below campus peers and assistant professors are $5286 below campus peers.

For the dean's first appointment in March 2002, he received a commitment from the provost for $20,000 in merit salary increases for department of architecture faculty members. In 2003, these funds were made available and distributed by the department head. The figure is somewhat misleading, however, since $10,400 went to one faculty member to keep him from being recruited away by another university. In reality, the $20,000 salary pool increase became $9600.

In 2005, the chancellor and provost approved a request by the dean for $49,570 of additional funding for an existing salary line. That new funding allowed us to recruit and appoint a new associate professor with tenure from an underrepresented population community at a competitive salary of $75,000. In addition, a request for an annual research stipend of $10,000 per year was also approved for this new hire.
Since 2005, the dean and the department head have been more aggressively seeking, when appropriate, startup research funding for new tenure track faculty hires. In 2005, we received $125,000 in one time funding for research from the university for a new associate professor; in 2006, we received for a new assistant professor hire $30,000 in research funds from the university.

During fall 2006, all units, academic and administrative, were asked to make a 1.14% budget cut because of a shortfall caused by lower-than-planned enrollment. For the School of Architecture, this meant cutting our state-provided budget by nearly $44,000. Since over 93% of this budget supports salaries, we had to cut salary funding. The architecture department had a new tenure track position to be advertised that fall, so that salary line was where the cut had to be taken. The position was filled with a visitor. Spring 2007, at the annual budget request presentation, the dean requested a restoration of the fall turn back and a partial restoration was granted. At this same presentation, a request for increased faculty salary funding for both programs was made by the dean. A modest amount was requested, enough to simply signal a good faith commitment by the administration to our faculty to redress the salary differentials between our faculty and our regional and national peers. The administration was not able to fund this request.

Summer 2007, the dean performed a gender equity salary analysis. As a result, appropriate raises in the salaries of two women architecture faculty members were approved by the chancellor, taking effect beginning fall 2007. The salary of one woman landscape architecture faculty member was also adjusted. All three increases were funded from School of Architecture budget lines rather than from new monies from the university.

Since 2002, as a matter of policy and principle, the department head has been able to hire new faculty members at competitive salaries, but the problem of correcting the salary differentials for faculty members who have been here for a longer duration has only partially been redressed. We continue to be concerned about this issue.

Since our 2002 NAAB visit the head of the Department of Architecture distributed merit raises to permanent faculty at the annual rates shown below from FY03 through FY08:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 2.67% per year
Overall Budget Increase, including salaries and maintenance, compared to UA Colleges-2001-2006

1. Law School       44.0%
2. Engineering      35.7%
3. Business         34.3%
4. Architecture     26.5%
5. Agriculture      20.2%
6. Arts & Sci.      15.9%
7. Education       14.0%

CONCERN

The program is aware of the benefits of cultivating cultural and intellectual diversity of students, faculty, and staff. The efforts to date have not achieved the goals of the School of Architecture or the University of Arkansas.

Response

Curriculum adjustments made in the period since the last accreditation visit as well as a number under discussion are aimed at meeting the fundamental competencies necessary in a professional education while affording students a greater range of choice in terms of secondary focus through selection of increased numbers of electives, through electing to pursue a minor, or through participation in the honors program. These efforts are aimed primarily at fostering an environment of intellectual diversity among our students and of their faculty advisors. At the same time we operate under a belief that these choices will attract a greater range of culturally diverse students as they seek ways to bring their life experiences to bear in tempering their professional thrust. For additional information regarding our initiatives in this area, please refer to the response to Condition 4: Social Equity in Section 2.1.

Concern

Physical facility issues pertaining to life safety and accessibility issues require immediate attention.

Response

Please refer to the response to Condition 7: Physical Resources in Section 2.1 above.

Concern

Student performance criterion pertaining to environmental conservation has been minimally met. Additional attention should be paid to environmental and sustainability issues throughout the curriculum.

Response

There is no more important issue in our profession today than the stewardship of our natural environment. We recognize the necessity, and our ability to impact the future through promoting responsible practices and sustainable design to our students. In many cases we have long engaged in these issues, particularly as many of the faculty have design practices, either private, or at the Community Design Center, informed by an appreciation of the vernacular responses inherent in the historic structures and infrastructures of the Ozarks. We have, by necessity, expanded our attention to these issues through dedicated lectures and exercises in every level of the curriculum. The legitimacy of this effort has been buoyed by the hiring of Dr. Tahar Messadi in 2003. Dr. Messadi teaches in numerous
technology courses, serves as a consultant to students in design studios, has conducted studios focused on sustainability, and serves as the chair of the Western Branch of the Arkansas Chapter of the Green Building Council. In this capacity he has promoted continuing education opportunities in the area to faculty and students. Additionally we have recently received an endowment for the Twenty-First Century Chair in Communications Technology in Construction. One of the objectives in hiring for this position is to identify a leader in architectural production technologies aimed at reducing the waste associated with building.

We remain suspect of the tendency to pigeonhole issues like that of sustainability to a single class or studio as is often the case in professional schools when a prominent topic arises. All too often the issues become excuses for bad design, marginalizing the original premise and turning students and faculty away from addressing of the issue. Our goal is to allow the mindset of sustainability to permeate discussions at all levels of the curriculum and in the collective activities of our school community.

**Concern**

*Student performance criterion pertaining to accessibility have been demonstrated in selected exercises; however, the team did not find evidence that accessibility issues are considered on a regular basis.*

**Response**

We continue to promote accessibility as a necessary component of design through topical presentations and exercises in our technology classes and through requirements in design studios. We promote the necessity of inclusion in formulating design responses even as we do so in a building that in so many ways undermines our efforts due to its pre-existing conditions. In recent years are students have become all the more aware of the issue due to the physical limitations of a number of their classmates. Also of significance are the series of design/build projects completed at Camp Aldersgate by students from the earlier years of the curriculum. This experience, and the sensitivities gained by the students have helped to bring these issues to the forefront of subsequent studio activities.

**Concern**

*Student performance ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics has been met with the reservation that design problems engaging a broad range of natural site conditions has not been sufficiently addressed.*

**Response**

Our appraisal of this concern at the time of receiving the team report was that our studios were primarily engaged in the design of traditional urban infill sites. We do not believe this was an accurate reading of the range of site conditions we confront in our design studios. None the less we have endeavored to have students confront a full range of site conditions throughout their education in the program. Indeed most year levels either in a semester or year, engage in a mix of urban and rural and/or suburban sites. The exception would be in the Mexico and Rome studios, where we invariably confront infill situations, as the urbanity of these cities is their attraction in the first place.
Concern
The accreditation team is concerned that environmental systems, life safety systems and building service systems are not integrated into building design with similar attention (and faculty resources) that is provided for the integration of structural systems and building envelope systems.

RESPONSE
Parallel to our focus on sustainability we have increased attention to environmental systems. Again, the addition of Dr. Tahar Messadi, to the faculty and the use of professional consultants as critics, has allowed us to incorporate a greater degree of specificity regarding this topic in our technology classes. Additionally this has helped our students to achieve an increased level of legitimacy when incorporating these systems in their designs for the comprehensive studio. Issues of life safety and building services continue to be addressed in both studio and technology classes.

CONCERN
A great amount of craft has been demonstrated in the ability to represent structural and building envelope systems in model and graphic form. However, the team found little evidence of the students’ ability to make technically precise descriptions and documentation for purposes of construction.

RESPONSE
Please refer to the response to Condition 12.29: Technical Documentation in Section 2.1.

2.2 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO CHANGES IN THE NAAB CONDITIONS

We have adhered to the organizational changes (outline format) and to the change in nomenclature regarding the self-assessment document, including the description of our process for self-assessment. We already far exceed the minimum number of volumes in our library and the University of Arkansas is accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

A review of our the University of Arkansas Catalogue of Studies reveals that we do not yet directly reference the Student Performance Criteria as presented in the 2004 Conditions. The catalogue copy will be amended to address this oversight in the 2008/09 academic year Catalogue of Studies. In the interim we have addressed this with a link through our webpage (http://architecture.uark.edu). Additionally all incoming students receive the School of Architecture Orientation Guide which includes a statement regarding the NAAB Conditions and Procedures for Professional Degree programs in Architecture.

Of particular significance is the requirement that 45 hours of coursework not have architectural content. The university or general education core curriculum consists of 35 hours while students are required to take 12 hours of non-architecture or “free” electives, for a total of 47 hours of outside of architecture. 47hrs non-arch/157hrs total=30% of credit hours outside of architecture. The NAAB credit hour requirements are met by our Bachelor of Architecture degree.
The reorganization of the Student Performance Criteria has been addressed through faculty review of course content and curricular structure. The added criteria, Sustainable Design and Client Role in Architecture were previously addressed, as were other issues of content, albeit in the context of other criteria. Curriculum changes have occurred in response to the paring down of criteria to meet a level of either ‘understanding’ or ‘ability’. In parallel with this change and in response to the previous team report, we have shifted some curricular content to the studio where students may demonstrate ‘ability’ in the context of their design solutions.

The other most significant aspect of the condition changes is the requirement for the studio culture statement. This requirement, in concert with our own VISION 2001 core values, led to a multi-year study and self-review known locally as the ‘Dillion Initiative’, named for the outside consultant who helped us organize this effort. This effort has led to increased scrutiny regarding the climate in our studios and has paralleled the creation and adjustment of numerous administrative procedures aimed at promoting the university’s student-centered imperative.
3. COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CONDITIONS
3.1 PROGRAM RESPONSE TO THE NAAB PERSPECTIVES

The faculty and administration of the School of Architecture and Department of Architecture are committed to providing an environment in which the needs, expectations and aspirations of students are met and exceeded. An accredited degree is one of the most fundamental expectations of our graduates and an important measure of the quality of our program. The Department of Architecture takes the responsibility for compliance with the conditions of accreditation very seriously. Following our last accreditation visit and our subsequent review of the team report, the faculty, through the design coordinators, curriculum committees, and full faculty meetings has engaged in an on-going review of the criteria and the ability of our curriculum to meet and exceed them. As a faculty we are engaged in a constant process of self-evaluation and subsequent retooling of our curriculum and activities to ensure continued compliance, to find ideas and opportunities for improvements in the education we provide, and to capitalize on the range of expertise found on the faculty.

3.1.1 ARCHITECTURE EDUCATION AND THE ACADEMIC CONTEXT

All students who enroll in the architecture program (and many of their parents) participate in an intensive two-day orientation session which includes a general university orientation session, an introduction to the School of Architecture through departmental presentations, and an hour and a half question and answer session conducted by exemplary students currently enrolled in one of our programs. On the second day students meet with a student representative and the staff of the advising center to chart an initial course of study, including enrolling in their classes for the first semester. These orientation sessions, held primarily in June, are designed to provide an overview of all facets of life at the University of Arkansas. They also allow students a better sense of what they can expect their experience to be in the School of Architecture, and how to prepare themselves to benefit fully from their participation in our degree program. Great emphasis is given in these sessions to make the most of the school's strong advising support, to select the best elective opportunities across campus, and to, if eligible, participate in the Honors College. Additionally students are encouraged to participate in organizations and student governance. We strongly encourage foreign language studies, especially in the context of preparation for participation in our foreign study programs. We also emphasize the importance of the whole of the students' university education and encourage them to focus both on architectural classes as well as their university coursework and liberal studies. We also encourage concentrations within the department and minors in disciplines outside the School of Architecture, recognizing the increasing need for specialization in our global society.

By most quantitative measures, the Department of Architecture attracts a disproportionate share of exceptional University of Arkansas students. For example, of the approximately 664 University Scholarships awarded this year, 19 are enrolled in our First Year studio this fall. In addition, of the 57 students enrolled in the freshman studio this fall, there are 4 Chancellor's Scholars, 2 Honors College Academy Scholarships, and 2 University of Arkansas Leadership Award Scholarship recipients. The average ACT score (27.0) for our incoming students continues to increase and competes annually for the best on campus with a few departments in the College of Engineering.
We constantly hear comments from faculty throughout the university on the character, inquisitiveness and dedication of the architecture students they teach in their own classes, or with whom they interact in the context of other university disciplines.

The faculty of the school is well represented on campus relative to the size of our academic unit. This can be positive in that we have a prominent place in faculty governance, and a negative as the workload of the faculty from such a small unit seems overbearing at times. Every year the Committee on Committees solicits and subsequently appoints representatives from each of the ten colleges and schools unit to university committees. In addition to the numerous positions slated for representatives from specific academic units, and depending on the committee, at-large seats are available as well.

Department faculty are continually engaged in teaching and research activities beyond our two degree programs, maintaining a presence in the university core and expanding upper level offerings available to students from other programs. We continue to offer the “Basic Course in the Arts: Architecture,” a university-core course taken by hundreds of students each year. We use this class to provide an understanding of the fundamentals of our discipline for those students outside it, many of whom are likely to work with architects as clients, or as collaborators from other disciplines.

We are also currently submitting for approval a course proposal for a new University Core class entitled Diversity and Design, which will explore the reciprocal relationship between diversity and design by looking at how race, gender, religion, physical and cognitive ability, age, class, and geographic location affect and are affected by the design of media, products, architecture, and urban/regional design.

We are active participants in Fulbright College’s Honors Program. Architecture faculty members Kim Sexton and Ethel Goodstein-Murphree teach and co-teach with Fulbright faculty in cross-listed seminars. Architecture students have the opportunity to participate in this program with some of the university’s best teachers.

In spring 2006 two department faculty members (Kim Sexton and Tim de Noble) received separate Curriculum Development Grants for Interdisciplinary Honors Colloquia awarded by the Honors College. The grants fund the development of co-taught, cross-disciplinary honors courses to be offered in the fall of 2007. One course includes faculty from the History Department of the Fulbright College while the other involves faculty from the Humanities, Geosciences and the Center for Advanced Spatial Technology (CAST). The Community Design Center also offers opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students from other disciplines, including Environmental Dynamics and Public Policy.

Our lecture series is advertised across campus and the region and includes at least one speaker a year co-sponsored by the Department of Art. In addition we have co-funded speakers on topics of mutual interest with various units in the Fulbright College, including the Department of Classics, Fine Arts, and African American Studies.

Our program in Rome, Italy, established in 1986 continues to grow and prosper; we believe it to be one of the very best and most respected in that city. Our Rome Study Center is located in the historic center of Rome, very near the Piazza Navona. Since the fall semester of 2001, University of Arkansas students enrolled in the Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences have joined architecture students in our Rome Study Center. The Fulbright faculty teaching in Rome each semester has broadened the opportunity for
elective courses available to our students. The program is also available on a limited basis to students enrolled in other accredited programs of architecture.

3.1.2 ARCHITECTURE EDUCATION AND THE STUDENTS

The core values articulated in our mission statement define a framework of ethics and aspirations that are intended to encourage our students to pursue productive, and often personal, learning agendas while benefiting from the collective experiences that are unique to studio culture. The program takes seriously its obligation to students to offer a climate that nurtures individual and cultural diversity, that offers opportunities for multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary collaborations, and that encourages responsible civic and social engagement. By definition, these values support and encourage students to assume leadership roles during their school years, and to prepare them for extending that commitment later in their professional life. We stress, however, the power to lead derives from knowledge. As a result, our curriculum, designed to allow each individual to find the role and means for making contributions based on her or his own interests and capabilities, stresses intellectual diversity to the greatest extent possible in an accredited program. Moreover, we make every effort to provide positive role models for aspiring practitioners and scholars, and our personnel policies and faculty hiring programs are conceived to affirm this commitment.

In addition to fostering students' personal and professional development through its curriculum, the program has evaluated and revised internal admissions policies with a view toward nurturing students' diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity. The University of Arkansas has an open admissions policy that allows all students admitted to the university to participate in the pre-professional program in the School of Architecture. None the less we do limit entry into the design studios based on space limitations. Students having an ACT of 25, a high school GPA of 3.5, and applying by March 1 (with a declared major in architecture) in the year before entry are given priority for admission into the fall semester studio. An additional criterion, established through empirical evidence of success, requires completion of high school calculus or pre-calculus and physics for fall studio entry. Those not meeting these requirements are admitted to the program but are not allowed to enroll in Design I until the spring, following successful completion of their math and physics courses. Our research has indicated students who did not take physics in high school are less prepared for balancing physics and Design I, and since the implementation of this criteria in the fall 2004, physics grades have consistently risen. These students enter Design I with the ability to focus on studio while continuing to satisfy their core requirements. We value all students having a strong foundation and recognize students perform best when they are prepared. Design II is offered in the summer for these students, allowing all students enter Design III in the fall of their second year prepared to manage the demanding second year curriculum.

In addition, all first year students must successfully complete Architectural Design I, Design Methods I and Physics for Architects I with a minimum grade of “C.” Furthermore, they must maintain a 2.0 GPA overall as they work toward completion of the core. A grade less than “C” in any one of the above mentioned courses will stop their progress in the studio sequence, and they must successfully repeat the course in order to continue.

Admission to the professional program occurs in the spring of the third year. The Advising Center evaluates and reports on the status of each student’s performance relative to completion of the University Core and to the criteria of maintaining a 2.0 GPA in each sub-discipline of study in the program: design, technology, and history/theory. This ‘gate-valve’ has allowed us to identify students struggling in one or more areas and to advise
those whose academic record indicates the likelihood of continued compromised performance. Students failing to meet the entry requirements are withheld from enrolling in the profession program until all deficiencies are rectified. In that the requirements for graduation parallel the grade point requirements of this admission process, the professional program admission process was motivated by a desire to abate the problem of students meeting the credit hour requirements for graduation without meeting the performance criteria necessary for a diploma. The review of students is conducted by the department head and the staff of the advising center. The department head communicates admissions decisions to students and oversees any appeals. Faculty are consulted as needed in cases of apparent grade anomalies to determine if personal crises have adversely affected performance in one or more classes.

Particular attention focused upon the retention of students in the first year of the program, where attrition traditionally is greatest, has resulted in improved retention rates. First year mentoring is undertaken in the spirit of the First Year Experience, a campus-wide initiative to intensify students' connection to university life. The School of Architecture joined this initiative in fall 2001. We are one of only two colleges in the University with mandatory participation in the First Year Experience program. In the fall of 2007, an expanded version of the First Year Experience course will be introduced. Leadership by Design further explores the importance of the transition from high school to a design education and provides students with resources for success in all aspects of their beginning years. Upper level mentors work with small groups of first year students to facilitate reading discussions and activities. The mentors are learning valuable leadership skills while impacting the experience of our beginning students. Potential outcomes for this course include self-awareness and self-respect, communication and leadership skills, professionalism and altruism. This course is the first of its kind across campus and perhaps in the nation, and is required for all first year architecture and landscape architecture students. Enrollment for Fall 2007 is 134. In fall 2000 the university revised its academic progress, suspension, and dismissal policies, in order to encourage first-year retention, and in recognition of the difficulties many students face in making the transition to university life.

The four-year Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies has long been available for University of Arkansas students who have an interest in architecture but prefer a liberal arts education or start the Bachelor of Architecture program but for various reasons, decide to pursue another direction inside or outside of the discipline. The curriculum of both programs is concurrent for the first year and a half, allowing students to transition between the two programs without significant loss of credit or ‘burning’ of elective credit on degree-specific classes. Significant numbers of students opt for the four year degree in preparation for graduate study in architecture and other disciplines.

In order to provide students with the critical information needed to make decisions concerning their academic programs as well as to shape their future, we have multiple levels of advising available to students, including professional academic advising and faculty mentoring. In the first two years of the program, given the fairly prescriptive options for courses both within the program and in the University Core, students are advised by the staff of the advising center. Prior to their third year of study, students are assigned a faculty member who serves as their academic advisor throughout the remainder of their time in the program, allowing for mentoring relative to academic interests and anticipated concentrations after graduation. In order to track each student’s academic record, all advisors have access to forms charting the courses completed and the performance in each.
Providing opportunities for personal growth and maturation are important aspects of our commitment to students. Students are always asked to participate in our faculty hiring process, and the dean’s office and the departmental offices have long maintained open-door policies. We are pleased to observe that larger numbers of students are increasingly dedicated, demonstrating commitment to both academic work and to the School of Architecture community. Both the dean and the department head have formed student advisory committees which serve as a formal means for student representatives to convey concerns to the administration. Student leadership is once again strong, positive and effective, as evidenced by pro-active leadership and growing constituencies in AIAS, CSI, and Tau Sigma Delta chapters, as well as in the founding and subsequent activities of ReVision, an interdisciplinary group dedicated to community service design projects.

Finally, the program is committed both to facilitating students’ engagement in local conditions and to cultivating their awareness of the milieu of contemporary architectural culture through exposure to the national and international context of practice and the work of the allied design disciplines. Together our annual lecture series, invited critiques, and international programs connect students to a provocative global community of scholars and practitioners. Visiting professors and critics also contribute to broadening our students’ connections with the architectural community and the allied disciplines. The John G. Williams, Fay Jones, and recently inaugurated 21st Century Visiting Professorships allow us to bring in great teachers and distinguished practitioners in a continual process of pedagogical reflection and growth. The connections established through these visitors have afforded faculty and students expanded opportunities through professional connections and academic recommendations.

### 3.1.3 ARCHITECTURE EDUCATION AND REGISTRATION

The dean of the School of Architecture is an ex-officio member of the State Board of Architects, allowing for more direct representation of the needs, interests and expectations of students before that body. It also ensures timely communication of board actions and changes in the registration and regulation of architects, including those that may impact their internship experiences.

The department head serves as an at-large (and previously as Northwest Section Chair) voting board member of the Arkansas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. The dean is also a member of this board. In this capacity the department head has spoken to recent graduates (Associate AIA Members) at the state convention regarding the importance of pursuing licensure, particularly in light of the recent national trend of sporadic numbers of interns doing so.

Most of our students, while pursing their degrees, aspire to become architects; it is one of their clearest and most tangible goals. We ensure they are well informed about the path to licensure; education, internship and IDP, and the ARE. They are strongly encouraged to participate in activities of the school’s AIAS and CSI chapters. The performance of recent graduates on the Registration Exam confirms for us some success in achieving our intention to prepare them for licensure by integrating knowledge from lecture classes, particularly in technology and practice classes, into the studio in a meaningful way. At least in part as a reaction to our graduates’ recent performance in the graphic building technologies section of the exam, we have re-directed our third year, second-semester design studio toward the exploration of building technology with particular emphasis on building envelope and its integration/interaction with structure.
3.1.4 ARCHITECTURE EDUCATION AND THE PROFESSION

As a traditional five-year undergraduate professional degree program, and the only one in our state, we are fairly conservative in that we are inclined toward the preparation of students for architectural practice: the building of buildings, and the building and rebuilding of cities. While this is our inclination, we continue to seek a balance between the extremes of design as a speculative enterprise and as a service.

The School of Architecture Professional Advisory Board, active for many years, has played an increasingly important advisory role in the affairs of the school and the Department of Architecture. This group of distinguished architects, landscape architects, engineers, and other allied professionals, including alumni and members of recent graduating classes (whose travel is subsidized by the Board), meets twice each year on campus with administrators, faculty and students. A significant portion of each meeting has been organized as a symposium on the relationship between practice and education, on the needs and expectations of each, and on how they may become more mutually beneficial. These meetings focus on issues of practice and on the trends that tend to realign the periphery of the profession.

The Professional Practice class (ARCH 5314) serves as the primary venue for conveying practical knowledge necessary for practice, for redefining the parameters of practice, and for discussions on the ethical responsibilities of the profession. The course includes numerous presentations by visiting experts and uses case-studies as a means of investigating the relationship of process, product, and client in the context of architectural production.

In addition to other national and international visitors, practitioners from northwest Arkansas and from the state and region are regularly invited to participate in design reviews and project juries. Their participation in these venues is mutually beneficial to all as the exposure of the students to these professionals helps to illuminate expectations and vice versa, allows practitioners insight into trends effecting design at the academic level. We also employ a cadre of local professionals as adjunct professors to reinforce these benefits.

The School of Architecture sponsors an annual career fair. Always well-attended by regional and national firms, this event provides students with valuable exposure to professionals and to potential employers for summer positions and for internship opportunities. The career fair is also an important opportunity for these professionals to interact with significant numbers of our students and faculty so they may better understand our program.

The school’s chapter of the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS) continues to be an active part of the school, in social activities and in providing and promoting pre-professional activities. The current leadership of the organization is working to focus on promoting campus sustainability as a galvanizing enterprise that will sustain interest and involvement in the organization beyond the vicissitudes of the strengths of successive leadership.
The student chapter of the Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) has been particularly active and effective in establishing close contact for students with architects, constructors, materials suppliers, and other related professionals, by bringing them to Vol Walker Hall. Meetings are scheduled regularly throughout the academic year.

The dean continues to work with representatives of the construction industry, the construction management program at the University of Arkansas-Little Rock, and with the University of Arkansas’ College of Engineering to establish better communication and potential collaborations that will allow a broader base of opportunities for our students. These discussions have resulted in the periodic offering, available to our students, of a Construction Management course through the School of Engineering.

3.1.5 ARCHITECTURE EDUCATION AND SOCIETY

We believe strongly our program is dedicated to the spirit and core values first outlined in 1996 in Building Community: A New Future for Architecture Education and Practice, by Ernest Boyer and Lee Mitgang. Now a decade old, the values addressed in the book are ones our faculty and students embrace. The faculty and staff of the department of architecture, and many of our students, feel a deep commitment to our social and cultural responsibilities, as well as a deep sense of responsibility to the many and disparate institutions and constituencies that we influence through the works of our discipline. As evidenced herein, we have endeavored to develop programs and activities that make significant contributions in our students’ education, and that make direct and measurable contributions to the lives of people in our community, our state, and our region.

Each semester, fourth-year and fifth-year (spring only) students are afforded the choice of participating in elective studios focusing on a range of societal issues and incorporating various degrees of community involvement, direct or otherwise. Our John Williams and Fay Jones Visiting Professors, in alternating semesters, offer studios focusing on complex architectural and urban issues. At various times the visitors have addressed situations in or around Arkansas or in their home venue. Each semester, students may elect to work in the School of Architecture’s off-campus Community Design Center (UACDC) for design studio credit. There they are involved in community-based design projects focused on sustainable planning and development, working closely with representatives of social and civic organizations, or with members of community groups. This provides valuable experiences, preparing students for situations they will encounter in practice and other professional activities. We are studying ways of making this experience an attractive choice to a greater number of students than currently pursue this option.

In addition to these offerings (dependent on enrollment numbers), Department of Architecture faculty members offer optional 4th/5th year studios, addressing significant community issues commensurate with their interests, including urbanism and sustainable design. Among the most popular of our offerings have been design/build studios. In the past we have focused on the design and construction of single family houses funded by the Community Development Corporation or Habitat for Humanity. We have completed one house since our last accreditation visit in 2002. In the spring of 2007 we engaged in the design of a commercial kitchen in the Girt Town neighborhood of New Orleans. Provided funding is obtained, this project will be built in collaboration with CITYBuild, the Tulane University based organization coordinating the design/build activities in New Orleans. We will once again offer design/build activities, in fall and spring 2007/08, though they will focus on small-scale community projects with less strident technical
demands than residences. We believe this type of project is more appropriately suited to the cadence of the academic calendar and provides a greater range of experiences in the field for our students.

Recognizing the value and popularity of design/build activities, while realizing the pitfalls of supplanting foundation studios focused on fundamental issues in the earlier years of the curriculum, we have developed on-site learning through the completion of four accessible design/build projects at Camp Aldersgate in Little Rock, Arkansas. The Aldersgate mission is to provide a social camping experience for children with various disabilities. These projects, including an archery pavilion, a tree house, an amphitheater, and a picnic area, have been completed under faculty direction in the summers and have been available as an elective experience primarily for underclasspersons.

We have established agreements with the School of Architecture at the Third University in Rome (Roma Tre). This relationship allows our students in Rome access to Roma Tre classes, faculty (some of the best and most distinguished in Italy), library, and computer labs. In addition our students have participated in a number of design charrettes, teamed with Roma Tre students, developing designs for specific urban problems in and around Rome.

Each semester, Roma Tre students come to Fayetteville to study in our program. The students are enrolled in design studios and lecture classes commensurate with their abilities and their level of accomplishment at Roma Tre. These students have proven to be wonderful additions to our program, in many ways adopted and mentored by our students and return the favor when our students reconnect with them in Rome.

Over the past 13 years, we have successfully fostered relationships with all of the major architecture programs in Mexico City, including U.N.A.M., specifically the Max Cetto Studio, Anáuac, Tec de Monterrey, and IberoAmericana. Faculty members from these programs participate in reviews of our students’ work and serve as studio critics and lecture contributors. At times, largely dependent on conflicting programs or requirements offered by their home institutions, students from these programs participate in our summer Mexico Studio. When this is the case, our students are teamed with these students for the design studio portion of the program. The student design and field study work has been published in Arquine, while the design problem for the 2005 studio was served as the basis for the program for the 2007 Lyceum competition.
3.2 PROGRAM SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

At regular intervals, the faculty and students of both programs, as well as alumni on our advisory board, review our efforts, procedures, and structure in educating students. In all cases our self-critique includes appraising our efforts relative to the goals set forth in the Vision 2001 plan and the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation while recognizing the unique qualities of the educational model we have developed at the School of Architecture. These qualities have emerged from the diverse interests and talents of our faculty in response to the peculiarities of our place in northwest Arkansas, and have allowed us to elicit the greatest achievement from the students who attend our program.

The committee structure of the faculty has varied over the past few years along with the changes in leadership. Standing committees include the Coordinator’s Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Honors Committee. The Coordinators Committee is comprised of the design studio year coordinators as well as representatives from the history/theory and technology faculty. It has evolved as an important forum for on-going critique and self-assessment of the effectiveness of the design studio sequence and of the effectiveness of coordination and integration of content and pedagogy throughout our program, with particular attention to the NAAB Perspectives. This group meets regularly but with greater frequency early in each semester. The Curriculum Committee and its sub-committees, many formed to address specific curricular topics, are charged with revision of the program descriptions and policies in the department’s section of the University catalogue. The Honors Committee reviews the requirements of the Honors program and its sequencing relative to the curriculum as a whole. In the past year we have also held full faculty meetings to discuss curriculum and policy changes initially debated in these other venues.

Any permanent (voting) faculty member, the department head, and any department committee may forward a curriculum or procedural proposal to the department faculty, or directly to the Curriculum Committee, for consideration. Depending on the nature of the proposal and its origin, it is then forwarded to the Curriculum Committee where it is reviewed in the context of current curriculum. Finally, the curriculum committee presents all proposals to the department faculty for approval. Upon approval, “minor” changes to the curriculum, for example, changes in prerequisites, are submitted by the Advising Center staff to the university for inclusion in the Catalogue of Studies. “Major” changes to the curriculum, including substantive changes in course content, are subject to review by the University Committee on Courses and Programs, which, in turn, directs their recommendations to the Faculty Senate for final approval.

In most years we have held a “Spring Review” with representative work from all year levels presented to invited critics from schools outside of our region. The last such event occurred in 2005. This is intended to be both a showcase for our students work and an opportunity to reflect on the evolution of our program. In line with these aspirations, we invite critics from some of the more highly regarded graduate programs in architecture, which has provided benefits to those students who pursue graduate education. We purposefully seek those with a critical eye towards studio pedagogy to prompt our self-assessment process. While applauding our strengths, these critics invariably provide frank, serious assessment of the nature of our intentions and measures of our success.

More recently we have used the forum of the review of the Comprehensive Studio in the fall in a similar manner. Most critics participating in this review also participate in the reviews of the other years in the days preceding the Comprehensive Studio review. At the very least the critics are apprised of the overall curriculum through tours and
meetings with associated faculty. As such this review has served not only as a venue to review the student work, but invariably evolves, by design, into a protracted, freewheeling discussion regarding the nature of architectural education and the cumulative effect of our efforts in preparing the students for practice and/or advanced education.

In the spring of 2006, all elective (4th/5th) studios focused on the issue of transit-oriented development (TOD) for Northwest Arkansas. Visiting critics, including Eric Kahn (Fay Jones Visiting Professor) of COA (Los Angeles), Bill Conway of the University Of Minnesota, the UACDC, and two resident faculty members, Professors Greg Herman and Tahar Messadi, led these studios in a concerted effort to study the potency inherent in this type of development and its effect on the future of our region. This ‘focused’ discussion, like that of the Comprehensive Studio, provided an excellent opportunity for the faculty, spurred by others, to appraise our pedagogical accomplishments and direction.

In a similar and seemingly equalizing manner, the Professional Advisory Board meets twice each year to review the quantities and qualities of our program and to provide additional perspectives on the effectiveness of our efforts. In these meetings faculty and administration present synopses of the departments’ activities for critique by this body, comprised primarily of practitioners in architecture and the allied professions. In parallel, the board members provide updates on trends affecting the profession. Though constituted as a development support group, our Dean’s Circle, which also meets twice a year, is updated on departmental activities and inevitably serves in an advisory capacity.

The dean, with the director of development and the department heads, maintains close ties with a large percentage of architecture alumni and meets with many in events scheduled across the country, updating them on the department and receiving feedback in turn. Alumni events are regularly held in major cities and at the AIA National Convention. At each event the alumni are informed of the activities and challenges of the program and school.

Comments and reflections are sought from students in the form of a survey as a process of applying for graduation. The intent of this survey is to gain a sense of the students’ confidence in their degree as preparing them for practice or graduate study. This is followed up by another survey administered up to five years after graduation. This survey has been revised recently and is now being administered through the web and tabulated by the Office of Institutional Research in line with university policy requiring each department to assess its efforts in preparing students for their careers.

Annual review of faculty by a peer committee of faculty comprised of representatives from both departments serves as a basis for a quantitative assessment and commentary by the department head aimed at assessing individual contributions and effectiveness in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, service and collegiality. Collectively, these reviews provide the dean another basis for administrative assessments of our effectiveness and the quality of our program. There are also three-year, pre-tenure reviews for all tenure-track faculty to allow the faculty member and the departmental faculty and administration to assess the quality of the individual’s performance and to help predict their quality of fit and future performance.
**Program Strengths and Future Directions:**

We have great confidence in the overall quality of the education we offer and in the subsequent benefits to all the constituencies we serve within the university and beyond. A succession of positive, helpful accreditation reviews, as well as significant events including searches for a new dean and department head have allowed us to reflect on the state of the program and are aspirations for its change and continued improvement. We continue to willingly address changes in policy and curriculum in response to a changing profession, a normative part of our continuing evolution. In these endeavors we are informed by the continuing involvement of educators from other programs through our lecture series and reviews, as well as by our own faculty visiting other programs and reporting back their perceptions. We are anything but complacent and remain committed to building upon our traditional strengths while addressing weaknesses and omissions identified through this process of continual self-reflection and outside input. We remain confident in our curriculum even as we are committed to its continued evolution, both in response to the profession’s morphology and as a normative product of changes in faculty expertise and administrative directives. As evidenced in the development of the Leadership by Design program emerging from the ‘Dillion Initiative’, we are engaged in an ongoing transformational process intended to address the untapped potencies of leadership in our society by members of our profession as alluded to in the Boyer-Mitgang study.

**The Curriculum**

Our greatest strength, aside from the students, faculty and staff that implement it, is our curriculum. With its twin foci on professional education and liberal education, the curriculum inherently addresses a set of internal relationships and opportunities (the content of professional curriculum itself and its relationship to the profession) as well as a set of external relationships and opportunities (the world at large and the world of the larger university).

Internally, the professional curriculum is structured to develop fundamental competence by the end of third year so this knowledge may be honed and inventively applied in ever increasing self-directed explorations. Because of the number of choices available in the last two years of the curriculum, a student may choose to sample broadly without focus among the great courses offered in the school and in the university, may develop a minor or major concentration within the school, or may pursue a minor in another academic unit on campus. The proportion of professional coursework to non-professional coursework which accommodates this twin focus has resulted in some compression of the professional curriculum, necessitating what we would otherwise still choose; i.e. the integration of professional knowledge within the studios.

While there is undoubtedly at least a loose consensus on a departmental educational philosophy and ethic, as expressed by our recent statement of “Core Values,” we also have built into the operational fabric of the department an exposure to counter-positions and oppositions which both enrich and challenge us, student and faculty alike, through option studios, visiting critics and teachers, and our informal and formal lecture series. We see these venues as an opportunity to introduce irritants that ultimately temper our perceptions of, and aspirations, for our program.

The most exceptional single element of the curriculum is, without doubt, the international study experience our students receive, either in Rome or in Mexico. Both programs are very strong and well-established. We continue to strengthen them further by expanding our interaction with other universities, and consequently with a greater range of resident
faculty, through mutual events such as charrettes, lectures, reviews, and publications. We also realize the burden this requirement means to a number of our students, financially, and for those non-traditional students who may already have families or other obligations, personally. In an attempt to ameliorate these issues we have increased scholarship monies dedicated to funding international study. (See Appendix E)

The foundation of the Honors College and the growth of the Honors Program within the department have created significant opportunities for interdisciplinary undergraduate research. Although available to a select population of the department, the program is intended to pollinate other aspects of the curriculum, serving to raise the standard for investigation and scholarship across the curriculum.

Externally, our desire to educate our students liberally, to take advantage of being a unit within the larger university, manifests itself in choice as well, particularly in the upper years of the curriculum. Collaborative educational opportunities within the university are being aggressively explored, searching for meaningful external linkages.

**Faculty, Staff, and Students**

We are encouraged by the increasing quality of our faculty, staff and students. Our freshman class over the last several years has competed with two programs in engineering for the best freshman class ACT average on campus. Our communications director has been exemplary in disseminating information about our program in the press, broadcast media, and through careful marshalling of our publication efforts. The Academic Advising Center staff has succeeded in administering to, and charting students' performance and has worked with the faculty and department head to improve the educational experience for all students. Since our last visit we have added a full-time staff member dedicated to the digital communications and computer equipment within the school. We have also added a full-time technician in our wood shop. These staff additions have not only improved our lot, but have allowed for a much better teaching and learning environment. We are a faculty of diverse interests and enterprises informing our teaching, research, and service activities. We have a healthy balance of exceptional teachers, scholars and professionals. We realize the impact we have on our students, not only through our teaching and research, but in our ethic of service to our constituent communities as well.

**Alumni and Friends**

We maintain close ties with our alumni and friends through annual mailings including holiday cards, lecture series posters, the school newsletter, and through faculty and administration participation in alumni gatherings around the country. In addition members of the faculty and administration attend annual meetings of the state and national conventions of the American Institute of Architects where we host events for our alumni. As the only program in the state, we are in a sense bound to the profession we feed. In the time since the last accreditation we hosted a 60-year anniversary of the school attended by over 100 alumni, as well as a large memorial service for AIA Gold Medalist and emeritus Dean, Fay Jones.

**University Respect for the Department**

We have been fortunate that the department has earned and enjoyed the respect of the larger university. We are hopeful that this respect will soon translate into support for upgrading our facilities and for bringing faculty salaries in line with those of our peers.
Future Directions

We do not exist in a vacuum and accordingly realize that the higher education environment around us continues to change. With this change comes the realization that undergraduate professional education in the context of the academy is subject to ever greater forces tending towards sponsored research, graduate education, and public outreach. These issues temper our every discussion in the school and department, with particular attention to the last two years of our program. As a faculty we endeavor to confront these opportunities in the context of what is best for our constituencies, not in response to market pressures associated with fast-tracking degrees. In this vein we are currently studying the possibility of establishing a graduate program in architecture in parallel to our current professional degree.

3.3 PUBLIC INFORMATION

The program respectfully fulfills its responsibility to provide clear, complete and accurate information to the public, including language mandated by the NAAB, in the university catalog as well as in its promotional literature. Further, we direct particular attention to the manner in which the parameters of the accredited professional degree program is represented to prospective students, their parents, and the community. School of Architecture staff work in conjunction with University Relations, the clearing house for most printed materials produced on the campus, to assure that these obligations are met.

A description of the program, including the exact language specified by the NAAB appears on page 103 of the academic year 2007-08 University of Arkansas Catalog of Studies. The significance of the relationships among accreditation, licensure, and architectural education are underscored in its description of the Bachelor of Architecture curriculum. (See Section 4.8 for Catalog of Studies description of our program.)

All incoming students receive the School of Architecture Orientation Guide and Planner, which includes NAAB accreditation text. Student Performance Criteria are always available for review in the School of Architecture Advising Center.

3.4 SOCIAL EQUITY

The Department of Architecture is fully aware of the benefits that can be derived from cultivating cultural and intellectual diversity in its community of students, faculty and staff, and promoting such diversity in its curriculum. We are equally aware of our responsibility to foster an educational environment that encourages the free and responsible exchange of ideas, as well as to ensure a nurturing and supportive atmosphere for learning, teaching, and working. Further, the department aggressively supports and communicates to its faculty, staff, and students published University policies concerning social equity. Since 1991, the University Campus Council has abided by the following statement regarding discrimination; department policies for distributing resources and affording opportunities for participation in governance reflect its philosophy:

- The Campus Council of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, does not condone discriminatory treatment of students or staff on the basis of age, disability, ethnic origin, marital status, race, religious commitment, sex, or sexual orientation in any of the activities conducted upon this campus. Members of the faculty are requested to be sensitive to these issues when, for example, presenting lecture material, assigning seating within the classroom, selecting groups for laboratory experiments and assigning student work. The University faculty, administration,
and staff are committed to providing an equal educational opportunity to all students.

The university is committed to the policy of providing education opportunities to all qualified students regardless of their economic or social status and will not discriminate on the basis of handicaps, race, color, sex, creed, veteran’s status, age or parental status, or national origin.

These policies are communicated to the School of Architecture community through the University Faculty Handbook (section 5, “Policies on Employment, Student Records, and Sexual Harassment and Assault”), the University Staff Handbook (section 3, “General Employment Policies”), and the Student Handbook, available from the Dean of Students. Improving diversity among faculty, staff, and students remains foremost among the goals of both the University and the School.

**Diversity at the University Level**

Since 1996, diversity has been the focus of one of the five major goals of the university.

Beginning in 1996, the university has formally celebrated the accomplishments of Dr. Martin Luther King by hosting a series of events that heighten awareness of a variety of diversity-related issues both on campus and in the community. For the last two annual Martin Luther King Weeks, the dean has chaired the campus committee that organizes this celebration. Over the past several years, each academic school and college has also sponsored their own respective events. Last year, the School of Architecture brought Dr. Ted Landsmark, president of Boston Architectural College and then president of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, to campus for a presentation to faculty and students.

Beginning around 2000, the pace of activity in this arena picked up substantially on a number of separate fronts. In January 2000, Chancellor John White appointed a Diversity Task Force, a working group of students, faculty, administrators, and staff, and charged it with two objectives: to assess the climate for diversity on campus and to make recommendations for improving diversity throughout the university. The School of Architecture was represented on this task force. In fall 2002, the Diversity Task Force published the findings of its diversity surveys and the first phase of its three-year plan, *Diversity Plan for the University of Arkansas, Fall 2002-2005*. These documents are the result of more than three years of research conducted by the Survey Research Center and the UA Diversity Task Force, a committee made up of 33 members of faculty, students and staff.

In January 2005, Dr. Carmen Coustaut was appointed to a newly created position as the Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Diversity and Education, reporting both to the Provost and to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. In this position, she is responsible for collaborating with campus units to develop and implement strategies and plans to enhance diversity and inclusion on campus. Additionally, she is responsible for providing leadership to the Multicultural Center. In fall 2005, a Diversity Implementation Task Force was appointed under the leadership of Dr. Coustaut. A university-wide committee under the directive of the Provost and in concert with the Office of Institutional Diversity and Education, this task force was charged with continuing the work of the Diversity Task Force. The task force has been primarily working to facilitate the creation and implementation of diversity plans in the academic colleges, focusing on the critical areas of 1) curriculum and pedagogy; 2) recruitment and representation; and 3) climate, retention and graduation rate. By late spring 2007, all of the academic schools and
colleges had completed final drafts of their respective diversity plans. The task force remains active and will be developing reporting and monitoring plans for implementing their diversity initiatives.

Also in the fall 2005, a Reinitiating Team for Diversity was formed to evaluate the campus’s progress with respect to the initiatives identified in the University of Arkansas Diversity Plan. Consisting of students, faculty, staff, and administrators, the team decided to interview the numerous initiating agents across campus as a way to determine our progress. Interviewing began in the spring semester of 2006 and will conclude in the fall of 2007. The information from these interviews will be summarized and analyzed by the Reinitiating Team.

In spring 2006 under Dr. Coustaut’s leadership, a General Education Core Curriculum Committee (GECCC) was formed to serve as a monitor for the “effectiveness of the general education core curriculum to...ensure that the core meets the needs of this campus and its students.” The GECCC recognizes that diversity is critical to academic excellence: it helps students appreciate different cultures, it heightens their self-awareness, and it strengthens their intercultural communication skills. With the support of the Office of Institutional Diversity and Education and in search of structural suggestions and parameters in support of our curricular goals, the GECCC hosted a symposium in August 2006 on positive ways to foster diversity in the University Core curriculum. Since the symposium, the GECCC has worked diligently to establish a recommendation for a diversity component to the general education core curriculum. In alignment with our institutional goals, the GECCC would like to ensure that our students are provided with intellectual and practical opportunities to strengthen their appreciation for and understanding of cultures different from their own in order to prepare them to become responsible citizens of the world, committed to positive contributions to our pluralistic and increasingly global society. One senior architecture faculty member chairs this committee and another architecture faculty member is currently working with the committee to develop a university-wide general education core course entitled “Diversity in Design.” This course should be offered for the first time fall 2008.

In June 2006, the university’s Minority Recruitment and Retention Plan 2006-2011 was published through the provost’s office.

In fall 2006, a diversity awards program for university staff was initiated to reward and recognize individuals and teams exhibiting outstanding commitment to diversity. Also in 2006, a new certificate program was created to develop and recognize commitment to the diversity initiative through a certificate program recognizing training and/or community service in each of the areas covered by the diversity values statement.

In fall 2006 the chancellor in his annual report on the state of the university, declared that “Diversity is job one.” Diversity was thus given the highest priority among the five overall goals of the university.

2006 also saw the organization of a group entitled Faculty Scholars for Inclusive Excellence, spearheaded by the Office of Institutional Diversity and Education. Faculty Scholars for Inclusive Excellence (FSIE) is an initiative aimed at the development of an inclusive curriculum and classroom climate. Once implemented, these faculty scholars will form research groups to infuse diversity into the curriculum and to develop inclusive pedagogical techniques. The idea of FSIE represents a unique synthesis of two concepts, Inclusive Excellence, as defined by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and Faculty Learning Communities, developed at the University of Miami, Ohio. The FSIE initiative is currently being developed by a team of eight interdisciplinary
faculty members. Supported by funding from the Office of the Provost, the team is engaging in a grant-writing effort to provide initial funding for the FSIE program. In addition, the team will also explore ways to sustain the FSIE program in the future.

**Diversity at the School and Department Level**

Please refer to Goal 2 in Section 1.5, Program Self-Assessment as well as our response in Section 2.1 Summary of Responses to Team Findings.

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR ACHIEVING EQUITY AND DIVERSITY IN FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, REAPPOINTMENTS, AND PROMOTIONS:**

In letter and intent, the Department of Architecture Personnel Document, approved in August 1998, was conceived to foster social equity, with particular attention to avoiding inappropriate bias and discrimination in language and content. Moreover, the personnel document asserts that the department “has the responsibility of creating an intellectual climate that encourages inquiry in research and creative activities of the faculty,” a cornerstone to assuring that academic freedom is protected. Further, it is agreed that architecture is a diverse and multi-faceted discipline. In other words, diversity is understood to be much more than a matter of how we look; it also encompasses issues of how we think and what we believe. These values are apparent in personnel policies as well as in procedures for faculty recruitment and retention.

All architecture faculty positions are advertised and filled in compliance with policies established by the University Office of Affirmative Action. The department continually and actively seeks faculty candidates who will broaden the cultural base of our program. Although changing demographics point to increasing diversity in the Northwest Arkansas region, notably the dramatic growth of Hispanic and Asian-American populations, northwest Arkansas has long been perceived as suffering from a lack of racial diversity, and to a degree, this seemingly continues to hinder our efforts to attract qualified minority candidates. This said we did succeed in hiring an assistant professor of North African descent and a senior-level African-American faculty member since our last accreditation. The later hire was successful in part due to the allocation of extra monies from the university administration specifically targeted to competitive hiring of minority candidates. The department has enjoyed reasonable success in recruiting and retaining women faculty. This fall (2007), of 17 full-time faculty, including administrators, 6 are women. The department’s initiative in hiring women was recognized with funding from the Office of Academic Affairs Strategic Hiring Fund (spring 2000) to enhance the salary of one of these appointments. In the summer of 2007 the dean adjusted the salaries of three female faculty members in the school based on gender equity considerations.

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR ACHIEVING EQUITY AND DIVERSITY IN STUDENT ADMISSIONS, ADVANCEMENT, RETENTION, AND GRADUATION:**

Annually, the department documents its recruiting, advising, and retention goals in a “Recruitment, Advising, and Retention Report” prepared for the Office of the Provost (see Appendix D). The department’s recruiting goals highlight the importance of attaining greater cultural diversity in our community of students, and our curriculum promotes intellectual diversity. By affording greater access to the widest range of opportunities in the School of Architecture and across the campus, students can build upon their unique interests and capabilities to adapt the Bachelor of Architecture degree structure to their individual needs and academic objectives. These ideals are made clear to prospective students from our earliest contact with them.
Student Recruiting
Student recruitment is a function of the School of Architecture Advising Center. Although the school is an active participant in university recruiting programs sponsored by the Office of Admissions as well as in select statewide college recruiting fairs, our most successful efforts emanate from our own outreach efforts.

All inquiries from and contacts with prospective students are documented and entered in the School of Architecture Advising Center database. Prospective students receive literature describing the program. The school’s Academic Advising Center initiates follow-up contact, and all prospective students are encouraged to arrange a campus visit. Architecture program faculty are committed to direct participation in the recruiting process, and all campus visits include meetings with them. Whenever possible, students are invited to participate in a drawing exercise with a member of the design faculty; visits to classes in session are encouraged, as is direct contact with students in the first year and upper level studios. Members of the school’s Professional Advisory Board and Dean’s Circle regularly express interest in involvement with recruiting activities, and often meet with prospective students in their communities.

The department targets recruiting efforts to encourage diversity, and continually explores avenues for diversifying the student body, including: networking with the university’s International Students and Scholars Office and Multicultural Center to raise awareness of the design professions among minority and international students; creating outreach programs that foster an awareness of architecture among K-12 students; and engaging our strong alumni base in recruitment efforts. In addition we have held summer classes for area GT programs, as well as participated in and consulted area GT educators on their ‘architecture component’. We believe you never begin too early in exposing potential students to the joys and rigors of our profession.

Although we have yet to achieve the level of representation of American students of different races and cultural heritages for which we strive, the presence of international and exchange students contributes substantially to the cultural diversity in the program. Every semester, our continuing exchange program with Roma Tre University brings Italian students to our school, enriching our program with their international perspectives on architectural education. In addition to these formal exchanges, we benefit from international students who are pursuing their professional degrees in Arkansas. At this time, we have students from South Africa, The Caribbean, Korea, China, Japan, Bolivia, Brazil, and Mexico. These young men and women are among our strongest students.

Admissions
At this time all students, including true freshmen, transfer, and international students, who have been admitted to the University of Arkansas, are eligible to participate in the pre-professional programs of the School of Architecture. Students who require developmental work, however, must remove deficiencies before registering for courses in the major. To better serve transfer students, the Advising Center has developed a series of articulation agreements with community colleges in the state that assure the seamless transfer of students from two-year programs into the pre-professional curriculum. Enrollment in the fall/spring design studios (ARC 1014 and ARC 1024) is limited by spatial constraints and determined by competitive selection based on high school or transfer grade-point average and ACT or SAT scores.
The University of Arkansas Department of Architecture maintains three distinct tracks of study for entering freshmen to accommodate all students interested in pursuing a degree in architecture. The three tracks of study are designed to foster learning and to build strong foundations for students entering the program with different skill levels and high school backgrounds. Students accepted to the University of Arkansas with the intention to participate in the BARCH or BS programs in the Department of Architecture will be classified as “Regular Admissions” (fall/spring studio students or spring/summer studio students) or “Pre-Architecture Admissions.”

Regular Admissions
All “Regular Admissions” students entering the Department of Architecture are classified as either “Fall/Spring Studio Students” or “Spring/Summer Studio Students.”

Fall/Spring Studio Students
All students who have an ACT score of 25 or above and who have completed a college preparatory curriculum in high school are admitted to the FALL/SPRING track of study. The high school curriculum must include physics and an upper level math course (pre-cal or higher) for a student to be considered. This track of study is designed to immerse students in the rigor of the architecture design studio while completing required core courses. The studio is capped at 60 students. A review at the end of fall semester is required for all students. Students who fail to achieve a minimum grade of C (2.0) in both Design I and in physics are not allowed to continue into Design II. Students may enroll in Design II after successfully completing Design I and physics with a minimum grade of C (2.0).

Spring/Summer Studio Students
Students who meet the University of Arkansas minimum requirements for admissions but with an ACT below 25 and have not had physics or pre-calculus in high school are enrolled in the SPRING/SUMMER track of study. These students begin the design sequence with Design I in the spring semester and follow with a six-week summer course (Design II). This track of study allows students to focus on the foundations of physics, math and additional University Core courses in the fall semester without the additional work of Design I. Students in good standing (a minimum of C (2.0) in physics and required University core courses) at the end of fall semester, may take Design I in the Spring. Students who do not achieve a minimum grade of C (2.0) in Design I may not continue into Design II. Students may enroll in Design II after successfully completing Design I with a minimum grade of C (2.0). Students who successfully complete Design I and Design II will begin Design III in the Fall Semester.

At the completion of the third year of the five-year curriculum, including completion of the 35-semester credit hours of the University Core requirement, students may gain admission to the Professional Degree Program. Students are evaluated for admission on the basis of academic performance in architecture and general education courses, demonstrated commitment to serious work, a sense of responsibility to the opportunities offered by the school, and contributions to the school community. Admission to the professional program requires a majority vote of the entire Department of Architecture faculty, which serves as an admissions committee. Students who fail to gain admission to the Bachelor of Architecture degree program have several alternatives, including executing remedial work in the department and reapplying to the professional program, or pursuing alternative opportunities and degree programs in the school and the university. Every effort is made to assure students that the admission review is,
primarily, an advisory procedure. Since the implementation of this policy in spring 1999, fewer than 10% of applicants per year are denied admission to the professional program; the majority of these students remain in the School of Architecture.

Retention and Graduation:
Student retention and graduation rates are crucial issues for the entire university community. Following 18 months of study, in September 2000, a university-wide Retention Task Force issued a report that dispelled a variety of preconceptions about university retention and graduation rates, which across the campus have proven relatively low in comparison to peer institutions, and issued recommendations for improving performance. The program recognizes, however, that the rigorous pre-professional training and demanding studio culture essential to our curriculum render the dynamics of retention and graduation in architecture unique among undergraduate programs on our campus. We have planned retention practices and goals accordingly.

Typically, the School of Architecture meets, and often exceeds, the university’s goals for first-year student retention, currently set at 88% for 2010, and the majority of students who leave architecture remain in the university, (see Appendix D).

Since the 1999-2000 academic year, the School of Architecture has offered a four-year degree, the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies, (previously administered by the Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences), which incorporates course work from the professional program with liberal studies. With its identity reestablished as an offering of the School of Architecture, the four-year degree has emerged as a viable option for students with interests that fall outside the parameters of the accredited professional degree program. Capturing the degree has aided in the retention of students who aspire to attend graduate programs in architecture or to pursue careers in allied disciplines.

The program’s retention goals include developing institutional research that tracks student retention to help us better understand what factor’s influence decisions to leave the architecture program, refining our body of institutional research to enhance our understanding of the factors that contribute to student success in the program, and continually enhancing peer and faculty mentoring projects. A keystone of all of these efforts is a strong academic advising program (See Section 3.7).

Efforts in student retention begin as early as new student orientation, a program required for both new and transfer students. The program recognizes that the orientation experiences play a role in the school’s ability to retain and graduate students. The School of Architecture orientation, developed in concert with the university’s New Student Orientation program, strives to both instill enthusiasm for the School of Architecture as a unique community on the campus as well as focus on clear academic expectations for both parents and students. Current students and faculty are involved in the orientation to solidify the students’ bond to the institution, break down barriers to communication, and help ease the anxiety of the transition to college. A panel comprised of current students answer questions and addresses such issues as time management, transition from high school to the studio environment and program expenses. The School of Architecture Orientation Guide and Planner reinforces these efforts with information about program requirements and campus resources. The School of Architecture encourages its entering students to participate in “Rock Camp,” a university-wide five-day transition program held the week before classes begin.
Particular attention focused upon the retention of students in the first year of the program, where attrition traditionally is greatest, has resulted in improved retention rates. In addition to the active engagement of first-year studio faculty in retention efforts, in fall 1997 the program instituted a peer mentoring program in which upper class students serve as mentors for the first year class. Through this initiative, first-year students benefit from the experience and knowledge of their peers in the student community; at the same time upper class students have the opportunity to develop leadership skills. Upper-class mentors receive training prior to participating in the program, and efforts are made to associate first year students with upper class mentors who share particular challenges (i.e. non-traditional students, students with disabilities, etc.). In the fall of 2000 the University revised its academic progress, suspension, and dismissal policies, in order to encourage first-year retention, and in recognition of the difficulties many students face in making the transition to university life. Accordingly a form of first year mentoring was undertaken in the spirit of the First Year Experience program, a campus-wide initiative to intensify students’ connection to university life that the School of Architecture joined in fall 2001. The FYE or First Year Experience classes have been an important component in our increased retention of students. Our FYE courses have covered universal topics, including stress and health management, as well as intra-school related issues with studio culture and career opportunities.

Beginning in 2003 we hired selected 4th and 5th year students to serve as teaching assistants in the first year architecture design studio. The teaching assistants not only served as critics on assignments, but also served the first year students as mentors who are readily available to talk to students about any issues that they face in the architecture curriculum and beyond. This proved to be very successful, as our new students felt automatically connected to the upper level studios by virtue of having them as teaching assistants. We are now shifting these assistants to the new Leadership by Design course where they will continue in their role as mentors and, being joined by teaching assistants from Department of Landscape Architecture, will promote cross-disciplinary interchange.

This Leadership by Design course will provide skills for succeeding in a design education, including personal health, ethical behavior, and will promote the potency of design leadership in the community. The course is endorsed by the dean of the school and both department heads and addresses many issues of particular importance to students in a design education, mainly time and stress management, communication skills, leadership and service. In addition, mentors from 3rd, 4th, and 5th year will be involved to help first year students transition into these demanding programs. The new course is an expanded version of the First Year Experience course and affords the same benefits as similar courses across campus.

Upper-class students have the opportunity to identify a faculty mentor. In view of the many career paths and sub-disciplinary specialties that characterize the practice of architecture, decisions made at the undergraduate level have great potential to shape life-long learning and praxis. This program seeks to inform students of this potential through informal dialogue with a faculty member. It also aims to bridge the real and perceived gaps between university education and traditional practice. Further, the mentoring relationship creates a linkage to the on-going professional evolution mandated by the Intern Development Program (IDP).
The logistics of financing a university education figure in all studies of student retention. For architecture students, who face the additional costs of computer purchases (required by the second year of the curriculum) and mandatory international study programs, access to funding is of critical importance. School of Architecture development efforts have included an aggressive program of creating endowed scholarships. Currently, over 65 awards and scholarships, including both need-based and merit awards, are available to students in the School of Architecture; particular attention has been devoted to providing scholarship opportunities to support participation in the Rome and Mexico programs. Most scholarships are awarded annually on the basis of recommendations made by the school’s Scholarships and Awards Committee. Endowing the program with resources necessary to attract and retain a highly qualified and diverse student population remains at the forefront of our development goals. (See also Strategic Plan, Goal 10; Criteria 9, Financial Resources)

With a relatively small and self-selective student body, the Department of Architecture strives to achieve as high a graduation rate as possible among students who continue beyond the first year of the program. Once students are admitted into the professional program, their progress toward the degree is assessed every semester as part of the requisite student advising process. Increased rigor in enforcing pre-requisite requirements and encouraging timely completion of the university General Education Core through policy and advising are substantially improving our graduation rate. Most importantly, faculty and administration are exploring ways to insure that the program provides a supportive climate for learning, diminishing design education’s historical tendency to foster a “boot camp” environment, a situation that has placed obstacles to successful completion of professional education in the paths of many students, particularly minorities and women. (See also Strategic Plan, Goal 3.)

DESCRIPTION OF THE MEANS BY WHICH FACULTY, STUDENTS AND STAFF ARE GIVEN ACCESS TO THE FORMULATION OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES INCLUDING CURRICULUM REVIEW AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT:

With a relatively small faculty, the Department of Architecture enjoys considerable ease of communication and exchange of ideas. The dean and department head have long promoted an “open door” policy for faculty, students, and staff alike. In addition to the regular procedures described below, the dean may seek faculty, student, and, as appropriate, staff and/or professional advisory board input on key initiatives, for example, articulation of our vision statement.

Faculty

The architecture faculty meet regularly to address policy and procedures as required, as well as to address timely matters emanating from the ordinary conduct of classes. Issues of policy and news that impact the entire School of Architecture are addressed at regularly scheduled all-school meetings, which include the faculties of architecture and landscape architecture, representatives from the Community Design Center, Garvan Woodland Gardens and the school staff. Meeting minutes are circulated electronically. At both the school and the department levels, tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty vote on personnel and curriculum decisions; all faculty, including visitors, are welcome to vote on other issues.

In recent years, efforts have been made to streamline the school and department committee structures. Faculty committees are responsible for developing policy in the areas of peer review, student honors and scholarship awards; library acquisitions;
computers and information technology; and student recruitment as well as in articulating curriculum decisions. The University Faculty Handbook stipulates that each department faculty is responsible for its curriculum. The department’s Curriculum Committee and its sub-committees for Technology/Practice, and History/Theory meet regularly to review, develop, and, as required, revise the professional program curriculum. All proposed changes in curriculum require the vote of the majority of the department faculty. Program and course changes are also subject to review at the university level, where School of Architecture faculty are represented on the Faculty Senate’s Undergraduate Course Committee and Undergraduate Programs Committee. In addition to the Curriculum Committee, the Design Coordinators Committee plays a pivotal role in leading discussions and forging policy concerning design studio pedagogy. Coordinators Committee meeting agendas are circulated in advance of each weekly meeting to the entire Architecture faculty, who are always welcome to attend.

**Students**
Both the dean and the department head conduct separate, informal meetings with the architecture student body. These committees meet once each semester, with additional meetings scheduled, as required, in response to specific issues. In addition, each design studio elects a student representative; design studio representatives are instrumental in the adjudication of such procedures as the selection of teaching award recipients. The most active voice of the student body is the School’s AIAS chapter; in academic year 2006-07, 20% of architecture students were AIAS members. The department head serves as the faculty liaison to the AIAS board. On-going efforts to include student representation on department committees will be formalized in fall 2007.

**Staff**
The Assistant to the Dean serves as liaison between the staff and the architecture program. Through regularly scheduled meetings with the dean, she is apprised of matters of policy and procedure of concern to the staff and she, in turn, tracks the requirements of the Academic Policy Series, issued by the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, for the dean, department head, and faculty. Meetings of the staff are called at her discretion.
3.5 

STUDIO CULTURE POLICY

Preface

In 2002, the AIAS released the Studio Culture Task Force report, challenging schools of architecture to reconsider the emphasis typically placed on the design studio. While the report applauded the studio as one of education’s best models, it also documented unhealthy practices and often counterproductive methods. The attrition in architecture programs was infamous, even celebrated, and in part, was reflective of these methods. Tales of harsh, disrespectful treatment of students associated with the critique rituals of design studio “juries” still abound as those faculty who survived these environments attain senior status in programs across the nation. Overcoming this “legacy,” while maintaining the quality of a program begins, perhaps, with convincing those faculty members who teach as they had been taught that high standards may still be achieved using newer, more respectful and more productive methods and ideas. Historically, many of the teaching methods being challenged were based on the false assumption that all architecture students will or should primarily be designers. This stance, of course, failed to recognize the fact that only a small percentage of professionals are actually called upon to be designers, that a broad array of other talents and skills are necessary to produce good architecture. Sadly, this position also often equated design talent with the quality and character of the person. Methods of teaching the gifted designer who might assume that role in practice are arguably different than those whose talents support other needed roles. Every graduate need not have, indeed cannot have, the potential to be the “hero” architect; shouldn’t we learn to recognize and help develop the strengths each student brings? We have surely learned by now that one size does not fit all our students; it never did.

We have taken very seriously the critiques on well-documented abuses and counterproductive methods of studio culture imbedded in reports such as that produced by Boyer and Mitgang. As a consequence, while we are intent on retaining the strengths of the design studio as an educational vehicle, we have also instituted curricular, procedural, and administrative changes to better accommodate the wide range of interests, capabilities and aspirations of our students. This is the fundamental goal of our studio culture policy.

Development of our Policy

While we are in agreement with these challenges to the status quo in design education, we believe our approach is different, more positive and ultimately more promising of helping us raise standards in the quality of the education we offer. More specifically, a great deal of empirical knowledge, both about college students and teaching methods, has been developed over the past several decades. The design schools, with inherited and traditional studio teaching models, have been slow to recognize the shifts produced by these new domains of knowledge. Though this knowledge has been developed primarily in the fields of education, cognitive psychology, and neuro-psychology, it seems obvious that we would miss a great opportunity to enhance the education we offer our students if we failed to access some of that information and to begin to translate its implications for design education. This has been the intent and focus of what came to be known across campus as “The Dillon Initiative.”

In January 2005, with the guidance of Barbara Dillon, a licensed professional counselor whose daughter is one of our alumni, we began looking at these domains of knowledge from the particular vantage point of design education. Four primary areas of knowledge were first examined:
1. We looked at information about the college student as a developmental work-in-progress and about the interrelationship between personal maturation (physically, intellectually, psychologically, etc.) and learning. Research has shown that learning is closely connected to the emotional and psycho-social maturation of students as well as to the cultural climate of the university or college;

2. We explored the concept of integrated intelligence. Progressive universities across the country are shifting from an emphasis on teaching to an emphasis on learning. The concept of “integrated learning” has been shown to be a most effective model in making this paradigm shift;

3. We were introduced to concepts about “emotional intelligence” and “emotional competencies,” because research has shown the importance of teaching the whole person rather than only being concerned about cognitive development. Further, competencies and traits included under the rubric of emotional competencies, once considered to be irrelevant to education, are now known to be essential for both educational and professional success; and

4. We discussed some of the developing strategies for optimizing learning. In particular we looked at the concept of the “teachable moment” and discussed both the positive and negative impacts of stress on learning.

Soon after a presentation on effective learning and teaching by a faculty member from the College of Education, a steering committee of faculty and administrators was formed to work with Dillon on what we have come to understand is our Studio Culture Policy.

As the steering committee continued its work, its members came to believe strongly that anything we can do as educators to develop or enhance certain affective traits in our students will enhance both their education, particularly in the design studio, and their prospects for success later. These traits were eventually organized by commonalities and articulated as a set of five clusters of affective traits that we feel will directly enhance our students’ capabilities as learners and as professionals. These five clusters have been labeled as:

1. Self Care/Self Respect;
2. Communication/Collaboration/Empathy;
3. Optimism/Perseverance/Confidence;
4. Professionalism/Integrity/Organization; and
5. Self awareness/Life-long learning.

(See Section 4.2 for a full listing of the traits in each cluster.)

In fall 2006, we conducted a survey of our students entitled The ABC Survey of Affective Traits: Attitudes, Behaviors, and Climate in Professional Design Education. The survey helped us understand where our students stood in terms of valuing and/or having these traits and has helped us develop a plan for integrating affective learning into our curricula.

Conveniently, each cluster will be introduced to the students in the corresponding year of their curriculum, i.e. trait-cluster 1 will be the focus in year 1, trait-cluster 2 in year 2, and so on through five years. Along the way, we discovered that collectively these traits are the same as those valued under new paradigms of “leadership,” hence the name change in the implementation vehicle of our studio culture policy from “the Dillon Initiative” to “Leadership by Design.”
Benefiting from a fortunate series of coincidences, we discovered three university programs that in a number of ways paralleled some of our own intentions. Each now offers us something of value as we begin implementing our policy. First, our “Five Clusters of Affective Traits” complement aspects of an initiative by the Office of Student Affairs called the “U of A Experience,” developed to enhance students’ education, development and experiences across the four or five years of their education. The “U of A Experience” addresses many of our concerns, particularly with respect to leadership and modeling healthy behaviors. In addition, like our policy, the “U of A Experience” is intent on producing well-rounded students who are prepared to become leaders in their professions. Second, in getting familiar with this university program, we discovered the Leadership Task Force, which has a wealth of information about the kinds of knowledge and skills we are looking at; the director of this program has offered reading and teaching materials as well as workshops for our students. And third, since 2001, the school has been a participant in the First Year Experience (FYE) program and is one of only two colleges on campus requiring all first year students to participate. Also implemented by the Office of Student Affairs, the FYE program is designed to aid students’ transition from high school to college. The one credit course introduces time and stress management strategies, study and test-taking skills, managing finances, and other topics particularly relevant to the beginning student.

We are confident that our Leadership by Design initiative is one very promising way to raise the standards for the education we provide, and is a way for the School of Architecture to serve as a campus, and perhaps national, leader in these important areas. Our ultimate goal, of course, is that through this initiative we learn to deliver an education that enables our graduates to leave us confident and inspired about the multiplicity of roles they might play and the contributions they might make in the world as leaders in their respective professions and communities.

**Sustaining the Effort**

The literature on studio culture, “the Dillon Initiative, “the First Year Experience,” and “the U of A Experience” have all contributed to our synthesizing the primary component of our studio culture policy, the Leadership by Design program. This program began its first year of implementation in fall 2007 and is required for all first year students of architecture and landscape architecture. We recognize that the transition into a design education is difficult for most students, and accordingly this first two course sequence will provide students with resources for success in their education and start them on a trajectory towards leadership in their respective professions.

This first year introduction will be followed by courses in each subsequent year that address the affective traits specific for that year level. We anticipate at this point that after the completion of a mandatory second year, students may elect to continue or not continue in the program. If they complete the full five years, upon graduation they will receive a leadership certificate and distinction on their diploma. In the first two years, student mentors from third, fourth and fifth year work with small groups of first and second year students. As the pilot year for this program, we do not yet have comprehensive evidence of success, but we are addressing what we believe to be important basic concepts contributing to a positive and productive studio learning environment.

**Parallel Strategies**

While the Leadership by Design course is the primary vehicle for addressing issues of studio culture, we have many other activities we believe add to our goal of a more
positive and productive educational environment. The following is a broad list of other ways we support that environment. It should be noted that many of these strategies have been a part of our studio methods for many years.

- Faculty members in each year level are encouraged to communicate with one another regarding test dates, field trips and deadlines to avoid overlaps in scheduling. In addition, when possible, studio faculty members work with faculty members in the history and technology sequence to encourage “cross-pollination” of topics and ideas.
- Since our last accreditation visit, teaching assistants have been used in the history and technology courses to assist faculty with the grading of tests and homework assignments. This allows faculty to provide students with feedback more quickly and also allows for in-class problems and practice tests to be offered as a productive means for students to learn the material. The teaching assistants are also gaining valuable leadership experience.
- Also since our last accreditation visit, teaching assistants have been used in the first year studio to provide more feedback for these students. The teaching assistants, who work in pairs, help students negotiate the studio learning method, the critique process and aid in the general transition from high school to a university design education. In addition, the teaching assistants (many of whom have gone on to graduate school or aspire to do so) are gaining valuable teaching and leadership experience.
- The Department of Architecture, reinforced by the department head, has adopted a positive approach to reviewing work, recognizing students learn better when they are “critiqued” rather than “judged” and are treated with respect rather than condescension or harshness. The faculty also acknowledges that students learn in different ways. Therefore, we try to provide different formats for developing, assessing and discussing work.
- Option studios provide students the opportunity to work in a variety of methods and processes on a variety of topics. In addition, students in those studios are often working with visiting professors with whom they can develop professional relationships for internships or employment.
- We offer a concentration in history/theory allowing students to expand their research methods in preparation for graduate study or alternate career paths. Also under consideration are concentrations in preservation and construction management.
- Our international programs in Rome and Mexico City provide students with diverse cultural experiences as they learn to navigate cities, communicate, and design in places with rich histories and contexts.
- Faculty advisors provide upper level students with direction in choosing electives and minors to complement their desired career path.
- Our lecture series presents students with traditional and non-traditional working methods and practices, integrated practices, and special information on topics like sustainability, diversity, multi-disciplinary research and other design related issues.
- The Department Head’s Student Leadership Committee (DHSLC) addresses specific issues within the department. This committee, formed of leaders and members of the various student organizations within the department, provides focused support to student organizations and offers guidance for student leaders to implement positive changes within the department. One likely outcome from the work of this group will be “brown-bag” lectures by faculty members on their areas of research, workshops, portfolio development, etc.
The Dean’s Student Advisory Board (DSAB), with representatives from all year levels and both disciplines, provides students with a venue for voicing needs, concerns and ideas and establishes open communication between the students and the administration. The advisory board meets once or twice a month and promises students an open forum for discussing any topic. The meetings confirmed what those on the “Dillon Initiative” committee already knew: our students crave a positive educational experience, desire to be part of a larger community, insist on being involved in meaningful projects, and need help to more fully develop into young professionals.

(See Section 4.3 for supporting documents of the Studio Culture Policy)
STUDENTS
During the 2006-07 academic year, the student population of the department of architecture included 275 full-time students (See 2007 NAAB Statistical Report, Section 4.7). Currently, women represent 34.5% of our students. Gender distribution has remained relatively constant, (approximately 1 female student: 2 male students), since the last accreditation sequence; similarly, the incoming first year class of fall 2007 is composed of 28% female and 72% male students. Fewer than 10% of our students represent minority populations, a statistic that does not differ drastically from the university population of approximately 12% African American, Asian, Hispanic, and Native American students. As indicated in elsewhere in this report, student recruiting efforts are addressing the discrepancy between the size of the African American and Hispanic populations in the state and their representation in the School of Architecture. International students represent approximately 5% of our enrollment; this too is consistent with the percentage of international students enrolled in the university.

Student’s Educational Backgrounds and Program Selectivity
The majority of students in our program (approximately 70%), as well as the greatest number of applicants to the program, are residents of Arkansas. Out-of-state students come from contiguous states, particularly Missouri, Louisiana, Tennessee (notably Memphis), and Oklahoma. Since academic year 1999-2000, the university has offered out-of-state tuition waivers to students from contiguous states who present an ACT of 24 together with a 3.0 high school grade-point average and maintain a 3.0 grade-point average while enrolled; this initiative is starting to make an impact on patterns of out-of-state student enrollment in the School of Architecture. Generous university scholarships have aided in attracting outstanding out-of-state students to our program. At the end of spring 2007, the Department of Architecture has 14 Chancellor’s Scholars, 4 of whom are out-of-state students, and 5 University Scholars, two of whom are out-of-state students.

It is difficult to assess the educational preparedness of students entering the program. Students admitted to the university are expected to have completed a college preparatory curriculum in high school; nevertheless, there are great disparities among secondary schools in the state. As indicated elsewhere in this report, admission of new freshman and transfer students to the fall design studio is competitive; typically, between 60 and 70 students are selected. Since the last accreditation sequence, the average ACT of students admitted to the fall first year studio is 27.0; the average high school GPA is 3.7. The academic profiles of students admitted to the architecture program compare favorably to those of students in the larger university community.

Retention
Traditionally, the greatest attrition of students from the architecture program occurs between the beginning of the first and second years of the curriculum. During the period since the last accreditation sequence, freshman retention in the architecture program has averaged approximately 70%. Although discrete figures for the architecture program are not available, from a beginning freshmen cohort of 73 students admitted to the School of Architecture in fall 2006, 56.9% of those students stayed enrolled in the program. Although we have observed patterns of attrition between the second and third year of the professional curriculum, that rate of retention rarely dips below 90%. As noted elsewhere, a formal “gateway” to the professional program through academic review was implemented in Spring 1999. To a great extent, the program’s desire to improve
student retention influenced our decision to situate admission to the professional program in the spring semester of the third year. Prior to the institution of this policy, admissions to the professional program were determined at the end of the student’s first year of study. Delaying admission to the professional program affords students the opportunity to demonstrate their abilities in the three of the four principal areas of the professional core (design, technology and history) as well as granting them sufficient time to adjust to both university life and the rigors of the architecture curriculum. It is already clear that the procedure has increased student awareness of faculty expectations, helping us to implement higher standards.

The four-year architectural studies degree affords enhanced opportunities for retention of students who wish to pursue alternative career paths to that of traditional practice. This degree also offers an alternative for students who wish to prepare for graduate study in architecture or related disciplines. An increasing number of students are electing to pursue the four-year degree with a view toward completing their professional education in graduate school.

**Time to Graduation**
Since the last accreditation sequence, approximately 80% of students who have earned the Bachelor of Architecture degree have done so in the five-year period established for completion of the degree. Increasingly, students who do not finish their professional degrees in five years delay graduation in order to take greater advantage of the programs of the school and the university, including participating in both of our international programs and pursuing academic minors. (See also Condition 3.4, Retention and Graduation.)

**FACULTY**
**Distribution of Effort**
Typically, architecture faculty teach a design studio each semester coupled with a seminar or lecture course. The distribution of effort between teaching and other responsibilities of design studio faculty conforms to a school norm of 65% teaching, 25% research, scholarship, or creative activity, and 10% service to the school and/or university. The distribution of effort of faculty who do not teach in the design studio is adjusted accordingly, often to the university norm of 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. The department also has a policy of modifying the distribution of effort to facilitate scholarship and creative activity, service in national scholarly and professional organizations, and other professional development to enhance teaching expertise. To take maximum advantage of diverse interests and expertise, collaborative teaching and team teaching are encouraged, in both the studios and in the technology sequence in which each class is taught by at least two faculty. All faculty participate in design reviews at all levels of the curriculum.

**Student Evaluation of Instruction**
Student evaluation of individual courses and faculty is mandated by academic policy of the Office of Academic Affairs; (see Academic Policy Series, 1405.15, “Teacher and Course Evaluation Procedures,” and University of Arkansas Faculty Handbook, section 4-1, “Teacher and Course Evaluation Policies and Procedures”). All courses in the School of Architecture are evaluated each semester using the Purdue Teaching and Course Evaluation System; (see Appendix). Further, the Department Personnel Document assures that the perceptions of current students are duly considered when teaching
effectiveness is evaluated in making decisions regarding annual review and salary distribution, promotion, and tenure.

**FACULTY- STUDENT RATIOS**

**STUDIO FACULTY: STUDENT RATIO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruct</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year (ARC1014)*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year (ARC1024)*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Year (Option)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Studio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth/Fifth (Option)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2004/05: 20 Instruct 199 Students 10.0 Ratio 2005/06: 23 Instruct 216 Students 9.1 Ratio 2006/07: 21 Instruct 212 Students 10.1 Ratio

*Includes Teaching Assistants
DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF EFFORT BETWEEN ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES FOR EACH POSITION:

Dean, School of Architecture
The Dean of the School of Architecture administers and coordinates its four units: the Department of Architecture, the Department of Landscape Architecture, the Garvan Woodland Gardens, and the University of Arkansas Community Design Center. The dean reports to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In addition to providing pedagogical leadership in this multi-disciplinary environment, the dean represents the school at the university level through participation on the University Deans’ Council, and to its public constituency as a an ex-officio member of the State Board of Architects and the Board of the Arkansas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. Typically, the dean teaches one class each academic year.

Architecture Department Head
The Architecture Department Head, appointed by the dean with the counsel of the faculty, directs the professional and four-year degree programs. In addition to providing pedagogical leadership and facilitating the evolution of curriculum, the department head is responsible for faculty assignments and evaluation, course scheduling, liaison with students, management of the department budget, and administration of the department’s international study programs. The department head also promotes the personal professional development of the faculty. This position is a 50% administrative appointment; typically, the department head teaches in the design studio or offers a lecture or seminar course each semester.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF EFFORT BETWEEN ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES FOR EACH POSITION:

Support Staff
Assistant to the Dean:
Reporting directly to the dean, the Assistant to the Dean provides administrative support to the dean and to the director of development. In addition, the assistant coordinates the activities of the dean’s office staff as well as serve as a liaison to other staff in the school and its extension programs (the Garvan Woodlands Gardens and the University of Arkansas Community Design Center), and to the faculty.

The School of Architecture employs three full-time administrative assistants: one reports directly to the assistant to the dean, provides clerical, reception, and administrative support for the dean’s office. A second assists the architecture department head and faculty, while a third supports the landscape architecture department head and faculty. Both the Garvan Woodlands Gardens and the University of Arkansas Community Design Center maintain separate administrative support staffs.

Fiscal Management and Accounting:
An accountant monitors the School of Architecture budget, which is determined by the dean, as well as oversees, on behalf of the dean, the budgets of the Garvan Woodlands Garden and the University of Arkansas Community Design Center. In addition, the accountant manages purchasing, property control, and leave account reporting.
Advancement and Development:
A full-time Director of Development coordinates private gift support, and involves alumni and other constituents in pro-active functions that enhance the school of architecture. In addition to assisting the dean in these advancement activities, the director works closely with the University Office of Advancement, assuring a harmonious relationship between school and university advancement initiatives as well as in generating public support for meeting these goals. As an ex officio member of the school’s Honors and Awards Committee, the director of development also plays an active role in the stewardship of scholarships.

Public Relations:
The Director of Communications coordinates the design and production of all school publications, including Re:View, an annual 40-page full-color magazine; e:View, a monthly online publication; a spring piece that focuses on special topics; and brochures, posters, invitations and other printed pieces. The communications director also manages the school’s web site and all media relations. Finally the director of communications serves as the school’s liaison to the Office of University Relations, the public relations, communications, and marketing unit of the university.

The Advising Center:
A full-time academic counselor and Director of the Advising Center coordinates recruiting, admission, retention, and advising in the School of Architecture, and serves as the primary liaison to other divisions of the campus concerned with these areas of student life, including the University Registrar. The academic counselor also advises Department of Architecture students prior to their admission to the professional program. A full-time administrative assistant works with the academic counselor, as well as providing support to the academic administration, faculty, and students in the areas of prospective student visits, student records, awards and scholarships, career planning, and scheduling of classes. The administrative assistant also is responsible for maintaining the school of architecture list-serve, our most effective means for communicating with the student body, and keeping student records.

The Director of the Advising Center serves as a sounding board for students and a liaison between the students and the faculty in helping resolve and mediate any issues. Our students view the advising center as a “refuge” or “safe haven” where they can visit without having to necessarily discuss academics. Being in a small school, we are privileged to get to know every student in the program. We strive to remember where they are from and something special about each one. This familiarity promotes candor in discussions regarding their academic life and personal circumstances affecting their academic performance.

Many of the activities organized by the advising center are aimed at retention through establishing a close working relationships between the students, faculty and staff. Events that foster this “family-type environment” include an annual welcome picnic, competitive sporting events, dances, lectures, brown bag lectures, and cookouts.
The C. Murray Smart Media Center:
The media center is managed by a full-time Visual Resources Curator, who directs collection acquisition, development and cataloguing, and oversees digitization of materials for academic use. A full-time staff assistant provides support for these activities as well as overseeing operation and maintenance of audio-visual equipment for the school. Part-time student assistants facilitate daily operations during the fall and spring semesters.

3.7 HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

POLICY FOR HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES:

Faculty
For the faculty, individual scholarly and professional growth is supported with funding to attend conferences and meetings as well as through granting leave from teaching and committee assignments to facilitate professional practice activities. Since the last accreditation, all faculty requests for support to deliver refereed papers at academic conferences have been funded. The department also has a policy of adjusting teaching schedules to facilitate scholarship, service in national organizations, professional development, and service to the community. Supporting the personal professional development of faculty on tenure-track is a priority for the program, and these faculty receive priority consideration in requests for support of scholarly and/or creative activities. All faculty are eligible for off-campus duty assignments (sabbaticals) after six years of service. Over the last several years the dean has made research funds of $2500 available to each full-time faculty member.

Students
Through required courses and extra-curricular opportunities, students are encouraged to cultivate areas of interest that enhance their professional training. The structure of the B.Arch. curriculum offers flexibility and diversity through its elective course structure allowing students to take advantage of the larger university through selected courses, and the development of minor fields of study, both keys to fostering multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary collaborations. With the guidance of faculty, architecture students have developed significant undergraduate research projects which have won accolades in school and university awards programs. The department is committed to offering students both deep social engagement with the local community, particularly through the activities of the University of Arkansas Community Design Center, and diverse exposure to the global community, through travel at all levels of the curriculum, participation in our international programs, and annual lecture series. Such exposure is crucial for preparing students to thoughtfully and critically consider the socially and intellectually diverse milieu in which they will practice. Finally, the program promotes student involvement in professional organizations that build foundations for life-long commitments to activism and service. The program works with the state AIA chapter to assure that students have access to its annual meetings, and provides funding for two students, usually board members of the AIAS chapter, to attend the annual AIA Grass Roots Conference.

Staff
All School of Architecture staff are encouraged to pursue professional development opportunities that both enhance their areas of expertise and contribute to the growth of the program. In addition to attending programs offered through the university, staff
receive support to participate in organizations related to many of the program’s support functions, including the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) and the Visual Resources Association (VRA).

LECTURERS AND VISITING CRITICS BROUGHT TO THE PROGRAM SINCE THE PREVIOUS VISIT:

Visiting Lecturers
The School of Architecture presents an eveni
ng lecture series that brings prominent architects, landscape architects and planners as well as historians, critics, artists, environmentalists, and educators to the campus annually. To the greatest extent possible, lecturers are involved in studio critiques or seminar discussions in addition to offering a public lecture. The lecture series is funded in part by the school, and in part through generous contributions from the professional community and building industry.

Since the previous accreditation visit, the School of Architecture has enjoyed the following lectures:

2006-07
Andrew Freear, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, “Rural Studio: Let’s Talk Dirty”, The Wilcox Group Sustainability Lecture, 21 August 2006
Leo Marmol, Marmol Radziner and Associates, Los Angeles, CA, From Design/Build to Pre-Fab: The Process of Marmol Radziner + Associates”, 16 October 2006
Brian Healy, Brian Healy Architects, Boston, MA, “work lust”, E. Fay Jones Visiting Professor, 30 October 2006
Rueben Rainey, University of Virginia, “Landscape Architecture as Narrative: Villa Lante and the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial”, 16 February 2007
Mary Miss, Mary Miss Studio, New York, NY, “Thick Space”, 12 March 2007

2005-06
Peter Walker, FASLA Peter Walker and Partners, Berkeley, CA, ”Before the Memorial”, 12 September 2005
Sanford Kwinter, Rice University, Houston, TX, “Beat Science”, 14 September 2005
Marc Angelli, AGPS Architecture, Zurich, Switzerland, “How to Imagine As Many As Six Impossible Things Before Breakfast”, The Charles Thompson Memorial Lecture, 19 September 2005
Chris Krager, KRDB Austin, TX, “Archrepreneurs or: How I Stopped Worrying and
Learned to Build the House", 3 October 2005

Javier Sanchez, Higuera and Sanchez Mexico City, Mexico, “Recent Work”, 17 October 2005

Larry Scarpa, AIA, Pugh and Scarpa Architecture, Santa Monica, CA, “Ordinary and Extraordinary”, The Wilcox Group Sustainability Lecture, 24 October 2005

David Dowell and Dan Maginn, AIA, el dorado, inc, Kansas City, MO, “el dorado inc: Work in Place”, 7 November 2005

Nader Tehrani, Office dA, Boston, MA, “Disciplined Inconsistencies”, 30 January 2006

William Conway, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, “Recent Work”, 13 February 2006

Cornelia Hahn Oberlander, FASLA, FCSLA, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, “Limiting Footprints”, 20 February 2006


Teddy Cruz, estudio teddy cruz, San Diego, CA, “SD/TJ: Border Urbanisms, Relational Architectures”, 5 April 2006

Peter Eisenman, FAIA, Eisenman Architects, New York City, NY, “Luigi Moretti and the Origins of Post-Modern Architecture”, Cosponsored by Mississippi State University, 10 April 2006


2004-05


Richard Taransky, FAAR, “Mistaken Identity, 20 September 2004

Scott Erdy, AIA, “Exegetic Form”, 11 October 2004

Bill Wenk, FASLA, “Designing the Natural City: Toward a Functional Regionalism”, 18 October 2004


Adrian Luchini, AIA, “Midwest”, The Charles Thompson Memorial Lecture, 31 January 2005

Coleman Coker, “Parts Seen Within the Background of the Whole”, E. Fay Jones Visiting Professor, 7 February 2005


Ken Smith, “No Bushes”, 28 March 2005
2003-04

Thomas L. Schumacher, FAAR, “How Do You Spell Relief?”, 6 October 2003
Alan Tate, CSLA, “Making a Difference”, 10 November 2003
Rand Elliot, FAIA, “Shade”, 2 February 2004
William Braham, Ph.D., AIA, “Modern Color/Modern Architecture”, 9 February 2004
Gary Hilderbrand, FASLA, “The Medium is the Message”, 16 February 2004
Vito Acconci, “Untitled”, Co-sponsored by the University of Arkansas Department of Art, 1 March 2004
Steve Christer, “Scratching the Surface”, 29 March 2004

2002-03

Julie Snow, 23 September 2002
Dan Rockhill, 14 October 2002
Carla Corbin, 11 November 2002
Juhani Pallasmaa, 13 November 2002
Wendell Burnette, 10 February 2003
Kevin Sloan, 24 February 2003
William Braham, 3 March 2003
James Turrell, 10 March 2003
Brigette Shim, 14 April 2003

John G. Williams Distinguished Professors

In 1993, the School of Architecture honored its founder, John G. Williams, with the creation of an endowment, funded by individual contributions of at least $1,000, to support a senior visiting faculty position for distinguished individuals with records of significant accomplishment in both architectural practice and education. The intent of the program is not only to offer our students the opportunity to learn from highly respected professionals, but through interaction, to temper faculty discussions and responses to an ever evolving profession. Since 1997, the following distinguished professors have served in this position:

Brian Healy, Brian Healy Architects, Boston, MA, 2006
Javier Sanchez, Arq., Higuera + Sanchez of Mexico City, MX, 2006
Richard Taransky, FAAR. Richard Taransky Studio, Philadelphia, PA Fall 2004
Thomas R. Oslund, FASLA, FAAR, Oslund and Associates, Minn., MN, Spring 2004
Julie Snow, AIA, Julie Snow Architects, Inc., Minneapolis, MN, 2003
E. Fay Jones Visiting Professors
In 1999 Don and Ellen Edmondson established an endowed faculty chair in honor of the late E. Fay Jones, the prize-winning architect and professor of architecture long associated with the University of Arkansas School of Architecture. The $1 million endowment attracts nationally respected architects and teachers to the school of architecture to work with our students. Dale Mulfinger, one of the leading designers of cabins in the U.S. and author of “The Cabin: Inspiration for the Classic American Getaway”, served as the first E. Fay Jones Visiting professor in Fall 2003. From 2003 through 2007, the following individuals have contributed to the program:

Adam Gross, FAIA, Ayers Saint Gross, Baltimore, MD, 2007
Randall Stout, FAIA, Randall Stout Architects, Inc., Los Angeles, CA, Spring 2007
Eric Kahn, Central Office of Architecture, Los Angeles, CA, Spring 2006
Coleman Coker, BuildingStudio, Memphis, TN, Spring 2004
Dale Mulfinger, FAIA, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, 2003

Twenty First Century Chair in Communications Technology in Construction
The position is funded by a $1.5 million endowment funded by the Walton Family gift to the university during the capital campaign. The chair’s role in the 2007/08 academic year is to engage students and faculty in the discussion of architectural education in the age of integrative practice, digital design, and open share communication of information and data. He will present two public lectures, one to the School of Architecture and one to the AR state chapter of the AIA, and help the school to connect with other educators, students, and professionals interested in leading new directives in architectural education. In the fall he will conduct a three-part series of faculty seminars designed to bring us his perspective, as an architect and leading software designer, on the current state of practice and to promote critical consideration of how the evolution of architectural education can impact future architects and the practices of design and construction. The chair will lead classroom discussions with students in the professional practice course on the legal implications of integrative practice and BIM. In the spring he will co-teach a professional elective seminar on the ideological and practical opportunities open to architects who critically challenge the conventionally separate roles of architect, engineer, and builder.

BRAD WORKMAN, Bentley Systems

Other Visiting Faculty
In order to provide greater stability in the program, and to strengthen the faculty’s ability to bring depth and cohesion to the program’s pedagogy, the Department of Architecture has limited the number of visiting faculty. Nevertheless, visitors are appointed for one-semester and full academic year terms to assure diversity, to evaluate potential candidates for tenure-track positions, and to temporarily fill openings created by unforeseen changes in personnel. From Fall 2002 through Spring 2007, the following visiting faculty have taught at the school.

2007 FALL
Edward “Rich” Brya
Bradley Edwards
Bob Kohler
Kate Kulpa
Guest Critics for Mid-Term and Final Reviews
The program provides support for external reviewers to participate in mid-year and end term design studio reviews. In addition, local practitioners, faculty in allied disciplines, and emeritus faculty contribute generously to these events, affording special opportunities to build inter-disciplinary connections on campus and reinforce the relationship between the program and the local community of architects. The following is a representative sample of guest critics since the last accreditation.

2006-07
Amir Ameri, University of Colorado, Denver, CO
Scott Bernhard, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA
Rich Brya, 3GD Inc., Rogers, AR
Ian Caine, Washington University at St. Louis, St. Louis, MO
Andrew Jackson, Ove Arup & Partners, New York, NY
Giovanna Galfione, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA
Nils Gore, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

2005-06
William Conway
Katie Milhalevich
Sally Overbey
Charles Rotolo
Pia Sarpaneva

2004-05
Bradley Edwards
John Humphries
Bob Kohler
Samantha Perkins
Charles Rotolo
Esther Yang

2003-04
Darell Fields
Matthew Griffith
John Humphries
Esther Yang

2002-03
Matthew Griffith
John Humphries
Steve Luoni
Charles Rotolo
Benjamin Ibarra-Sevilla, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
Kate Kulpa, Polshek Partnership Architects, New York, NY
Joel Loveland, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
Tom Mills, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, RI
Vince Snyder, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX
Kelly Wilson, Harvard University GSD, Cambridge, MA
Bruce Wrightsman, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO

2005-06

Ed Blake, The Landscape Studio, Hattiesburg, MS
David Buege, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS
Coleman Coker, The Building Studio, Memphis, TN
Kyle d’Agostino, Giattina Fisher Architects, Birmingham, AL
John Durbrow, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, IL
John Forney, Fowlkes and Associates Architects, Birmingham, AL
Michael Green, Green-Anderson MEP Engineers, Fayetteville, AR
Walter Gronzik, Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, FL
Brian Healy, Brian Healy Architects, Boston, MA
Louis Joyner, Louis Joyner Architect, Columbus, IN
Sanford Kwinter, Rice University, Houston, TX
Joel Loveland, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
Larry Peters, Copper Development Association, Decatur, GA
Jennifer Riley, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
Javier Sanchez, Higuera-Sanchez Architects, Mexico City, MX
Kelly Wilson, Harvard University GSD, Cambridge, MA

2004-05

Kevin Alter, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX
Leonard Bachman, University of Houston, Houston, TX
Carl Bovill, University of Maryland, College Park, MD
Mark Boyer, Landscape Architecture, University of Arkansas
Richard Ferrior, University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, TX
Michael Green, Green-Anderson MEP Engineers, Fayetteville, AR
Sharon Hoover, Allison Architects, Fayetteville, AR
Jean LaMarche, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY
Dr. Bill Layher, Arkansas Forestry Commission, Little Rock, AR
Norbert Lechner, Clemson University, Clemson, SC
Tom Mills, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, RI
Beth Tauke, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY
Nader Tehrani, Harvard GSD, Cambridge, MA

2003-04

Kevin Alter, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX
Mark Boyer, Landscape Architecture, University of Arkansas
Peter Clarkson, Peter Clarkson Concrete Consulting, St. Louis, MO
Coleman Coker, BuildingStudio, Memphis, TN
Ursula Emery-McClure, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA
Scott Erdy, Erdy McHenry Architecture, Philadelphia, PA
Michael Green, Green-Anderson MEP Engineers, Fayetteville, AR
Dan Hoffman, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ
Jouni Kaipia, Washington University at St. Louis, St. Louis, MO
Tom Mills, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, RI
Wendy Redfield, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC
Humberto Ricalde, Monterey Tech University, Mexico City, MX
Tim Stenson, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA
John Tate, BuildingStudio, Memphis, TN
Nicole Wiedemann, University of Texas, Austin, TX
Kelly Wilson, Harvard University GSD, Cambridge, MA
Bill Zahner, A. Zahner Architectural Metal, Kansas City, MO

2002-03
Peter Clarkson, Clarkson Concrete Consulting, St. Louis, MO
Tom K. Davis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN
Mounir Farah, Middle Eastern Studies, University of Arkansas
Francisco Gomes, Gomes-Stubs Architects, Raleigh, NC
Chaim Goodman-Strauss, Mathematics, University of Arkansas
Michael Green, Green-Anderson MEP Engineers, Fayetteville, AR
Frank Harmon, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC
Tom Mills, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, RI
Dan Hoffman, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ
Patricia Kucker, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA
Michael McClure, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, LA
Ann Pendleton-Julian, Mass. Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA
Steven Quevedo, University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, TX
Roger Reed, A. Zahner Architectural Metal, Kansas City, MO

Public Exhibitions Since The Previous Site Visit
For its series of exhibitions, the program uses the “Small Gallery,” a securable space adjoining the main entry hall of Vol Walker Hall designed and built under the direction of Associate Professor Greg Herman. This space is our primary and only secure venue for traveling exhibitions and exhibitions organized by the school of architecture. Typically, student work appears in the “Large Gallery” on the second floor of the building. A representative example of exhibitions presented since 2002 include:

Travel Sketches, Dick Kellog, 2006
Catacombs, Tom Mills, 2006
Perspectives, Richard Ferrior, 2005
Travel Sketches of Al Adelott, 2004
Re Collecting Rome, Nicole Wiedemann, 2004
Underground, Tom Mills, 2004
Paintings, Kelly Wilson, 2003
Recent Projects, Jim Jones, 2003

DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES, INCLUDING ACADEMIC AND PERSONAL ADVISING, CAREER GUIDANCE, EVALUATION OF PROGRESS, AND INTERNSHIP PLACEMENT:

Advising
In fall 2000, the School of Architecture created a central Academic Advising Center to better meet the needs of our student population. The Advising Center coordinates and serves as a clearinghouse for information pertaining to all formal academic advising, registration, new student orientation, mentoring, degree audits and graduation
clearance. The school’s academic counselor advises first through second year architecture and landscape architecture students. In architecture, a faculty advisor works with third, fourth and fifth year students who have earned acceptance into the professional program and with third and fourth year students in the four-year architectural studies program. The faculty advisor and academic counselor work closely together to assure a harmonious relationship among these efforts and other facets of the school’s retention and advising initiatives, including the school’s mentoring programs, which are conceived to enhance, but neither to replicate nor replace the formal advising system.

The Advising Center also serves as the main resource for students seeking information on scholarships, financial aid, career opportunities, and all general information that is crucial in assisting our students with college life. The center strives to partner in advising and retention efforts by providing our students with all the tools necessary to make their college career successful. A student list-serve, established in fall 2000 that includes all students in the School of Architecture facilitates communication with the student body, assuring that information concerning academic affairs and up-coming events can reach them in a timely and comprehensive fashion. Every advising period, all students are given a copy of the state minimum core requirements and the sample curriculum for their major.

The Academic Advising Center is committed to providing timely, accurate, confidential, and individual academic counsel to all architecture students. When situations arises that demands personal counseling however, the advising center is committed to referring students other appropriate campus resources, including the Center for Educational Access, University Housing and, most important, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS). CAPS focus on healthful ways to manage stress is of particular significance for students of architecture.

**Evaluation of Progress**

Both university regulations concerning academic progress, suspension and dismissal, and internal policies and procedures, including review for admission to the professional program, concerning advancement through the design studio sequence govern the evaluation of student progress ( “Student Progress Evaluation,” see Appendix 4.1). In addition, the above-described advising system is intended to provide students with regular and explicit assessment of their progress toward graduation. Mandatory meetings with advisors, prior to each semester’s registration period, afford timely opportunities to monitor progress, and exit interviews, at the conclusion of every design studio, provide focused critiques of student progress. Finally, the faculty at each year level foster cooperation among the teachers of co-requisite design studios, technology, practice and history courses to assure that students’ progress through the curriculum is holistic.

**Career Guidance**

Through curriculum development and extra-curricular opportunities, especially the annual lecture series, the program exposes students to a variety of models for professional practice, including alternative career paths in allied disciplines. The required professional practice course is a prime arena for exploring career planning, including the Intern Development Program (IDP); the importance of IDP to students aspiring to licensure is reinforced by presentations by the state IDP coordinator offered in conjunction with the school’s annual Career Fair. Symposium discussions with the school’s Professional Advisory Board, instituted in fall 2000, provide another dynamic
forum for students to consider the reciprocity between professional, education, practice, and life-long learning, as well as the scope and diversity of architectural practice.

All indications show that our students are valued by architectural firms in the region and across the country. In response to a demand for our students by firms in the region and, more importantly, as a learning experience for our students, the school hosts a Career Fair every spring. Approximately 45 firms, including practitioners from Tulsa, Memphis, Nashville, Dallas, Springfield, Kansas City, Atlanta, Denver, New York, and Boston as well as Arkansas offices, participate, seeking both interns from the ranks of our spring graduates and summer employees among our second, third and fourth year students. Since 2006 the career fair has been organized by the Career Development Center. Electronic databases are used to invite participants and web-based services facilitate the scheduling of interviews, access to resumes, and viewing of portfolios. Career opportunities, including position openings, are listed on the school of architecture webpage and updated regularly. In the end, faculty mentors are undoubtedly our students strongest links to the profession, serving to recommend and often seek opportunities for our students at quality practices around the country and world.

**EVIDENCE OF THE PROGRAM’S FACILITATION OF STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES TO PARTICIPATE IN FIELD TRIPS AND OTHER OFF-CAMPUS ACTIVITIES:**

For the enrichment of our students’ education and in response to the relatively isolated nature of Fayetteville, the Department of Architecture strongly supports the integration of field trips into studio pedagogy and requires that all students participate in one of our two international urban study programs. Currently, fourth-year students participate in our Rome Study Center, near the Piazza Navonna, or fifth year students in our Mexico City program. An international program fee, assessed to all in the first eight semesters of design studio courses supports these programs.

**Rome Study Center for Architecture and the Humanities**

The School of Architecture is one of only a handful of design schools in the US that require international study as an integral part of their professional curricula. The Department of Architecture offers two very well-established and mature programs – one in Rome, the second in Mexico.

The School of Architecture has had a presence in Rome since 1986, and its Rome Study Center offers courses in architectural design, architectural and urban history, Italian cultural history and changing state of courses offered by visiting faculty from Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences. Between 1986 and 1988, the School of Architecture sponsored a summer program in Italy. For six week periods, students visited Rome and other Italian towns and villages to study their architecture and art. In 1989, the first full-semester Rome Program was established, and with the fall semester of the 1991-92 academic year, the full year, two-semester program commenced. Full semester architecture courses, including professional core, professional elective, and free elective offerings assure continuity with the Bachelor of Architecture curriculum as well as providing opportunities for students in the four-year non-accredited degree program.

With the Rome Center located in the heart of the city on the Corso Vittorio Emanuele, close to the Piazza Navonna and the Campo dei Fiori, students experience first hand the history, culture, heritage, art and architecture of Rome. The city is used as a laboratory to examine both historical Rome and the contemporary issues that influence design and planning in the city. In order to offer students a comprehensive understanding of the city, weekly site visits are organized to its principle monuments, and maximum
advantage is taken of its museums. Typically, in addition to various trips to historic sites around the city of Rome, students participate in an Italian study tour, which usually includes Florence as well other cities in Tuscany. They may also opt for a trip to Venice and environs. In order to soften the cost of this program, students pay a portion of their International Program Fee each of their first eight semesters.

The Rome Center is directed by Davide Vitali, an architect in practice in Rome. Professor Vitale is a tenured full professor in the School of Architecture; in spring 2001, he was also appointed Adjunct Professor of Humanities in the Fulbright College. Currently, adjunct faculty include Dr. Emilio del Gesso, an artist and art historian who teaches classes on the art and culture of Italy as well as leading many of the program’s field trips, Francesco Bedeschi, a Roman architect who teaches Architectural Design and Architecture in the City and directs the Rome Center computer lab, Bruna Kohan, a Roman architect who teaches in the seminar on the Itinerary of Modern Architecture at the Rome Center, Giovanna Piga, architect, who also teaches in the seminar on the Modern Architecture, and Dr. Simona Salvo, preservation architect, who also teaches in the seminar on Modern Architecture. Del Gesso also teaches in the Cornell University Rome Program, Kohan at the School of Architecture of the University of Roma Tre, Piga at the Philadelphia University School of Architecture in Rome, and Salvo at the School of Architecture of the University of Ascoli Piceno and at the School of Specialization in the Restoration of Monuments at the University of Roma La Sapienza.

With a view toward augmenting and diversifying the programs of the Rome Center, the School of Architecture has entered into a number of collaborative associations. Beginning in fall 2001, the University of Arkansas Fulbright College of Arts and Science joined with the School of Architecture in sponsoring and supporting the Rome Study Center, whose name was amended to become the Rome Study Center for Architecture and the Humanities. Through this collaboration, we have added interdisciplinary teaching and research at the center that will capitalize on the academic and scholarly strengths of both colleges. Beginning that fall, as many as 10 Fulbright College students, together with a Fulbright faculty member, have been coming to Rome each fall semester. The Fulbright faculty members in Rome teach two elective seminar or lecture courses in their respective specialties, subjects that take advantage of our location in Rome. These humanities courses welcome the participation of architecture students, and have provide an enriching collaboration for poor students.

In 2001 following several years of informal collaboration with architecture faculty from Universita degli Studi Roma Tre (the Third University, Rome), the School of Architecture, Fulbright College and the University of Arkansas itself entered into the a series of formal exchange agreements with their academic counterparts at Roma Tre. These agreements were the first of their kind between an American and an Italian university. To celebrate and recognize this pioneering effort, the chancellors of both universities shared in 2002 the ACUPII Prize, given by the members of the American Colleges and Universities in Italy (ACUPII). This ongoing relationship allows our students access to Roma Tre classes and faculty, which includes some of the best and most distinguished scholars and practitioners in Italy, as well as to its library and computer resources. In addition, beginning in fall 2001, our students have had the opportunity to elect an intensive Italian language class taught by Roma Tre faculty. In exchange, we host three to four Roma Tre students in Fayetteville each semester and have had extended teaching visits by architecture as well as humanities faculty members. In December 2003, works produced by students in Rome and in Fayetteville during the first three years of our relationship were put on exhibit at Roma Tre. In addition, Roma Tre and the Rome Study Center jointly
produced a book, entitled Andata & Ritorno: Fayetteville-Rome; Roma-Fayetteville, celebrating the fruits of our relationship.

On a discordant note, our Rome Study Center has at least since the advent of the European Union, experienced substantial fiscal challenges. The primary cause has been the inflationary economy in Europe induced by the union and the related deflation in value of the American dollar. Being as sensitive as we can to the cost of the program to our students, to date we have only made relatively small changes in program offerings or in program costs to ease the financial burden to the School of Architecture. However, facing a projected deficit of nearly $80,000 FY08, the dean and the RSC director have implemented additional cost saving measures. The dean has previously requested permanent partial underwriting from the university. The university has been unable to fund this request to date. Another option being actively explored at this time is to involve additional architecture programs to active better economies of scale. We are currently in discussions with Auburn University and Mississippi State University architecture programs. If these strategies fail, we will be forced to increase program fees to a level sufficient to operate in the black or with a reduced school subsidy.

Mexico Summer Program
Our eleven-week summer program in Mexico was first offered in 1994, in cooperation with the Universidad Anahuac. Extensive travel and intensive study, both in the urban fabric of Mexico City and across the country, are the hallmarks of this program. A design studio focused on the analysis of architecture and urban space in Mexico City is the focus of the program. In addition to design studio activities, students participate in field study exercises and are required submit 100 prescribed drawings from faculty-directed travels to urban centers and historic, including numerous pre-Columbian, sites. Students also enroll in a course on Mexican Modernism taught by faculty members from prominent architecture programs in Mexico City. Typically, students in this program live and take meals with local families. The program is centered at the Casa Barragán, a UNESCO World Heritage site in the Tacubaya district of Mexico City.

Prominent Mexican architects and critics are invited to contribute to design reviews, offer lectures, and host office visits. Among those colleagues who have generously participated in our program are:

- **Miquel Adria**, Editor, Arquine Magazine
- **Manuel Aguirre Osete**, Universidad de Anahuac
- **Víctor Alcerreca**, Professor, Iberoamericana
- **Catalina Corcuera**, Director, Casa Luis Barragan
- **Margarita Garcia Cornejo**, Professor, Iberoamericana
- **José Luis Cortes**, Director, Iberoamericana
- **Raquel Franklin**, Architectural Historian, Universidad de Anahuac
- **Alberto Kalach**, Architect, Mexico City
- **Enrique Lastra**, Architect, Oaxaca
- **Fernando Moreno**, UNAM
- **Cecilia Lopez de la Rosa**, Professor, Tech de Monterrey, Mexico City North
- **Carlos Mijares**, Architect and Professor, Mexico City
- **Louise Noelle**, Architectural Historian and critic, Mexico City
- **Humberto Ricalde**, Professor, UNAM, Architect Becker Associates
- **Maurizio Rocha**, Architect, Mexico City
- **Fernando Romero**, LCM Architects, Mexico City
- **Felix Sanchez**, Architect, Mexico City
- **Javier Sanchez**, Higuiera y Sanchez Arquitectos, Mexico City
- **Fernando Vasconcelos**, Architect, Principal NuevoEspíritu
Other Guests to the Mexico Summer Urban Studio

Luis de Villafranca, Coordinator, Iberoamericana

Ed Blake, Landscape Architect, Mississippi
Brian Healy, Architect, Boston, Mass.
Vladimir Krstic, Professor, Kansas State University
Brian Mackay-Lyons, Architect, Nova Scotia
Michael McClure, Professor University of Louisiana, Lafayette
Mark Shapiro, Professor, Kansas State University, Architect, BNIM
Bruce Sharky, LSU Landscape Architecture

Class Field Study Trips
Since the last accreditation visit, architecture students have participated in a variety of domestic field trips led and organized by the faculty in connection with required and elective courses in the professional program.

2006/07

- Altus, AR. Architectural Design 9
- Boston, MA. Architectural Design 8
- Boston, Massachusetts. Architectural Design 7
- Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas. Architectural Design 3
- Kansas City, Missouri. Architectural Design 4
- Little Rock, AR. Architectural Design 6 (Tech Studio)
- Los Angeles, CA. Architectural Design 8/10
- Los Angeles, LA. House Culture,
- Mexico City, Mexico. Architectural Design 8/10
- New Orleans, Louisiana. Architectural Design 8/10 and ARCH 4023
- San Francisco, CA/ Napa Valley, CA. Architectural Design 9
- St. Louis, Missouri. Architectural Design 7
- Fayetteville, AR. Fulbright Renovation, (Tech V)
- Fayetteville, AR. East Center Condo's, (Tech V)
- Fayetteville, AR. Innovation Center, (Tech V)
- Gentry, AR. Gentry Public Library,
- Fayetteville, AR. Fulbright Renovation, (Tech V)
- Fayetteville, AR. Innovation Center, (Tech V)
- Fayetteville, AR. Jones Residence, (Tech V)
- Little Rock, AR. Prospect Steel Corporation, (Tech V)
- Little Rock, AR. UAMS Campus – Patient Towers, (Tech V)
- Little Rock, AR. Clinton Presidential Library, (Tech V)
- Little Rock, AR. Heifer Headquarters, (Tech V)

2005/06

- Chicago, Illinois. Architectural Design 6
- Dallas, TX. Architectural Design 8/10
- Los Angeles, CA. Architectural Design 8/10
- Marfa, TX. Architectural Design 9
- Minneapolis, MN. Architectural Design 8/10

2004/05

- Bayou Bartholomew/Star City, AR. Architectural Design 9
- Boston, MA. Architectural Design 8/10
• **Buffalo, New York.** Architectural Design 8/10
• **Dallas/Fort Worth and Marfa, Texas.** Architectural Design 8/10
• **Los Angeles, LA.** House Culture
• **Memphis, Tennessee.** Architectural Design 8/10

2003/04
• **Blanchard Springs, AR.** Architectural Design 9
• **Chicago, IL.** Architectural Design 3
• **Minneapolis, MN.** Architectural Design 8/10
• **New York, NY.** Architectural Design 8/10
• **Oklahoma City, OK.** Architectural Design 6

2002/03
• **Albuquerque, NM.** Architectural Design 9
• **Chicago, IL.** Architectural Design 3
• **Des Moines, IA and Minneapolis, MN.** Architectural Design 5
• **Little Rock, AR.** Architectural Design 4
• **Siloam Springs, AR.** Architectural Design 4
• **Los Angeles, LA.** House Culture
• **Newbern, Alabama.** Auburn University Rural Studio, Camp Aldersgate Design/Build Studio

2002 Spring/ Summer
• **Nova Scotia.** Architectural Design 8/10
• **Kansas City, Missouri.** Architectural Design 4
• **Newbern, Alabama.** Auburn University Rural Studio, Camp Aldersgate Design/Build Studio
• **Kansas City, Missouri and Siloam Springs, Arkansas.** Architectural Design 6

**Study Tours**
Commensurate with faculty research interests and student demand, faculty members lead study tours offered for credit to all architecture students, as well as alumni and students in allied disciplines. In the past faculty members have conducted tours to Peru and Yemen. Since the last accreditation there has been a summer study trip to New Mexico. These opportunities are funded entirely by the students, with faculty travel and expenses subsidized by the department. No study tours are planned for the coming year.

**EVIDENCE OF THE PROGRAM’S FACILITATION OF STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES TO PARTICIPATE IN ADVANCED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES:**

**Honors Program**
The University of Arkansas Honors College, founded in 2002, serves as an umbrella, clearing house, and coordinating body for the six college-based Honors Programs, including that of the School of Architecture. When Honors eligible students enroll as architecture majors, they are invited to join the architecture Honors Program and become Honors College Fellows. Students who become Honors eligible after enrolling – i.e., by attaining a 3.5 gpa – receive a personal invitation to join the program. The department offers two Honors tracks – the Departmental Honors Scholar and Distinguished Honors Scholar – the course requirements of which are detailed in the University Catalogue. Honors courses are taught by top faculty members from all departments and colleges on the University.
of Arkansas campus; the department of architecture has thirteen professors on the Honors College faculty.

The Honors College serves as a catalyst for enhancing the academic experience for all undergraduate students. Through the Honors College, all architecture majors, not only those enrolled in the Honors College, gain access to Honors courses and many other resources. These include expert advising and preparation for pursuing graduate programs and prestigious national and international scholarships such as the Rhodes, Marshall, Truman, and Goldwater scholarships. Architecture students who are Honors College Fellows annually receive fellowship support up to $50,000 (plus non-resident tuition if applicable), a sum that exceeds the direct costs of tuition, room and board, and fees. Students may use the surplus for other educational expenses such as the purchase of a computer (a requirement for 2nd-year architecture majors), study abroad, or travel to professional conferences. Furthermore, Fellows and all Honors College architecture majors are also eligible for Honors College study abroad grants and Undergraduate Research Grants. Many students utilize these grants to subvent their required semester abroad at the Rome Study Center, and some still have funds remaining to finance additional study abroad opportunities in another semester or summer. Since 2002, the generous Honors College grants have indirectly extended the reach of the school of architecture’s own scholarship resources to support degree and travel expenses of even more qualified, non-Honors architecture majors than previously possible.

The Honors College provides some support to departments to staff core honors courses and develop cross-disciplinary courses, research, and service opportunities. For example, in the department of architecture, it pays for the Honors discussion section for the University Core fine arts survey, Architecture Lecture (ARCH1003), a potential source of late-decision architecture majors. The Honors College periodically sponsors curriculum development opportunities for faculty. Recently, two architecture professors won substantial Curriculum Development Grants for Interdisciplinary Honors Colloquia from the Honors College. Two architecture professional electives sponsored by these grants – Sacred Bodies / Sacred Spaces and Visualizing the Roman City are being offered during the 2007-08 academic year. Both courses are open to Honors and non-Honors architecture majors along with students from other disciplines across campus. The Honors College thus generously supports the school’s commitment to interdisciplinary, innovative teaching executed at a rigorous level.

The intellectual curiosity and energy of Honors College students culminates in the production of an Honors thesis. Since the implementation of the School of Architecture Honors Program, architecture majors have produced thirteen theses, five of which have garnered research support awards from state SURF grants or Honors College Undergraduate Research grants. In three years since the graduation of the school’s first Honors students in 2005, architecture Honors theses have explored a wide-range of issues, encompassing theoretical and applied knowledge as well as historical and humanitarian endeavors. The thesis opportunity augments an already varied slate of vertical studio offerings for fourth and fifth-year architecture students. Annually, formal Honors presentations showcase the thesis findings to the school community during final reviews. The research and production of Honors theses helps our students gain acceptance to some of the country’s most competitive graduate programs, including the MArch program at Princeton University, Ph.D. programs at the University of Virginia and Penn State, Master’s of Urban Design at Harvard’s Graduate School of Design, and the Master’s in Preservation at the University of Pennsylvania. Hence, the department’s
Honors program provides exceptional advantages, resources, and services for all architecture students who are engaged and committed to making a difference.

Honors Theses Presentations

2006-07

Katie Kummer, “Moving to the Suburbs: Fifty Years of Women Living the American Dream”, thesis director Ethel Goodstein-Murphree
Amy McCarty, “Thinking Outside the Box: The Future of Corrugated Fiberboard in Design”, thesis director Korydon Smith
Carl Paulus, "Trailer Treasure: Mitigating Between Public and Private in Manufactured Homes of Arkansas", thesis director Korydon Smith
Kara Pegg, “A Sense of Place When All Surroundings are Gone: Designing an Emergency Housing Prototype for Northern Arkansas”, thesis director Laura Terry
Rachel Smith, “Articulating the ‘Black Box’: A Spatial Analysis of Alwin Nickolais’s Choreographic Works”, thesis director Laura Terry

2005-06

Natalie Blair, “Death as a Theme Park: Heritage Tourism and the American Cemetery” thesis director Ethel Goodstein-Murphree
Kimberly Forman, “Los Angeles and the ambassador Hotel: the Role of Memory in Construction and Demolition”, thesis director Ethel Goodstein-Murphree
Ayodele Yusuf, “Engaging The Representation of the City, as a Visual Analysis, in the ‘Ordinary’ Planning Process”, thesis director Laura Terry

2004-05

Laurie Yazwinski, “Residential Slums of the 1950s and 1960s and Their Portrayal in Popular Media”, thesis director Ethel Goodstein-Murphree

2003-04


5 Kara Pegg received an Honors College Research Grant for this thesis
6 Rachel Smith received a SURF (Student Undergraduate Research Fellowship) Grant from the Arkansas Department of Higher Education for this research
7 Zachary Cooley received an Honors College Research Grant for this thesis
8 Justin Faircloth received an Honors College Research Grant for this thesis
Amber R. Murray, “Toward an Understanding of Norwegian Sense of Place”, thesis director Ethel Goodstein-Murphree


2002-03


H. Wilson Robertson, “Dwelling and Indwelling – Aalto and Wright”, thesis director Ethel Goodstein-Murphree

University of Arkansas Community Design Center

The School of Architecture offers opportunities for its students to engage in community outreach through the University of Arkansas Community Design Center. The center was founded in 1995 with the support of the Harvey and Bernice Jones Charitable Trust. It is currently funded through project fees, grants, and annual contributions by the university. Stephen Luoni has served as Director of the UACDC and held the Steven L. Anderson Chair in Architecture and Urban Studies since 2003.

The mission of the University of Arkansas Community Design Center is to advance creative development in Arkansas through education, research, and design solutions that enhance the physical environment. UACDC design solutions introduce a multiple bottom line, integrating social and environmental measures into economic development. Integrative design solutions add long-term value and offer collateral benefits related to sustained economic capacity, enhanced ecologies, and improved public health—the foundations of creative development. UACDC planning has helped over 30 Arkansas organizations to secure nearly $62 million in grant funding to enact suggested improvements.

Architecture, landscape architecture, and public policy students participate in the center’s off-campus facility for a semester. Some continue as interns to develop projects and reports that involve multiple semesters. Sometimes, students will engage a project midway through design, cultivating a specialty through focused attention to one aspect (e.g. in the housing studio, some students developed detailed housing typologies while students in the previous semester explored site planning and infrastructure design). The learning experience involves contact with communities, interested constituents, and partners from other disciplines. Similar to a graduate laboratory or research project, work products are a result of the center’s collaboration with students. Post-semester duties involve formatting of work, research, and editorial comments for publication by the center.

The center creates partnerships unique to each project, though core partners participate in most of our work. Through meta-disciplinary research and design principles, the center combines ecological, architectural, landscape architectural, and urban design solutions to address emerging planning challenges. Partners from allied disciplines (both within and outside the university) are involved in studio instruction and give seminars that support studio content. Design studios are taught collaboratively at the Community Design Center and led by design and planning staff, some of whom hold

9 Amber R. Murray received a SURF (Student Undergraduate Research Fellowship) Grant from the Arkansas Department of Higher Education for this research.
academic appointments. The design studio is the nexus for interdisciplinary research and development of recombinant design models. These partnerships are necessary for framing studio inquiries responsive to each community development issue. The center is committed to the development of planning models with design consequences beyond a single project. Our long-term goal involves establishment of sustained relations with state agencies and legislators to improve development protocols statewide.

UACDC activities since 2003

**Fayetteville: Habitat for Humanity of Washington County, Inc.** Commissioned 2007
Implementation of Low Impact Development Best Management Practices to Remediate Sediment from Urban Development in Fayetteville, AR by Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (ANRC) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and with Marty Matlock, Findlay Edwards, University of Arkansas Cooperative Extension Services, and McClelland Engineering
UACDC (principal investigator) and its partners received a $468,000 grant under the EPA’s Section 319(h) Nonpoint Source Management Program, and administered in Arkansas through ANRC, to develop a demonstration Low Impact Development (LID) of approximately 50 homes in Fayetteville. The grant also requires the team to publish a LID manual outlining urban water quality management methods and technologies for public distribution in Arkansas. Project tasks oblige the team to:
1) Develop municipal policies, based upon modeling and monitoring results, to protect streams from NPS impact from urban development, 2) Design a green neighborhood for Habitat for Humanity to demonstrate the value and effectiveness of LID technologies in Fayetteville, AR., 3) Measure the impact of LID technologies in reducing sediment loads to the White River in NW Arkansas, 4) Develop and Implement Educational Workshops for LID technologies, and 5) Reports.

**Rogers: Target Corporation and General Growth Development** Initiated 2007
Green Parking Lot Demonstration Project by Target and the Arkansas Forestry Commission (AFC), and with CEI Engineers
AFC offered to UACDC a $10,000 seed grant for design and construction of a low impact parking lot in Arkansas, which demonstrates green principles. AFC intended the grant to be matched by a big box retailer, who would sponsor lot construction. Before approaching Target, UACDC approached Wal-Mart several times to solicit their participation with no success. While Target has agreed to participate and match the planning grant, they must first convince General Growth Development, the company in Chicago who owns the site, to participate and build the green parking lot. UACDC has prepared three preliminary schemes to show General Growth Development feasibility.

**Rogers: Haynes Development** commissioned 2006
Oliver Farms Office Park and Development
UACDC was asked to explore planning options for a 40-acre commercial and office development with special consideration for preservation of the site’s distinguishing landscape characteristics.

**Fayetteville: NWA Museum Foundation** consultant 2006
UACDC was asked to explore different architect selection processes with the foundation board. Consideration included benefits, drawbacks, and cost implications for an open competition, invited competition, invited interviews, and selection of a signature figure in the discipline.
**Fayetteville: Nock Investments** pre-commission 2006
South Fayetteville Housing Development with Marlon Blackwell Architect
In collaboration with the office of Marlon Blackwell Architect, UACDC prepared a pro forma proposal for a 23-acre modern green development near the UA Innovation Center. The proposal was prepared to assist Nock Investments in securing bank loans. Upon securing bank approval, the collaboration will prepare a 100-unit master plan with residential typology strategies for guiding individual project development. The same consultants (Boyer, Matlock, Morrison Shipley Engineers, Inc.) involved with UACDC’s Habitat for Humanity project will collaborate to plan a green infrastructure for this private market-rate development.

**Lancaster County, Pennsylvania: HRG, Inc., commissioned 2006**
Mt. Joy Wal-Mart Site Plan & Design
UACDC was retained by HGR, Inc., an engineering vendor to Wal-Mart in Harrisburg, to prepare a schematic site plan for a Wal-Mart supercenter in a community with anti-big box ordinances. The Mt. Joy Board of Supervisors agreed to relax the prohibitive ordinances if Wal-Mart proposed a creative development. UACDC designed and presented the proposal, offering planning strategies to address the exurban commercial growth anticipated for Lancaster County. Though it was a contentious public hearing, the design concept won approval. While HGR has not included UACDC in design development phases, Wal-Mart did convey the prospect of including UACDC in additional planning efforts of difficulty to the company.

**Lake Wedington Management Unit: US Forestry Service** Initiated 2006
UACDC prepared a collaborative proposal representing the University of Arkansas in partnership with local, state and federal agencies to develop a master plan for 16,000 acres of the Ozark National Forest, Lake Wedington Management Unit at a cost of $312,000. The plan will provide a model regional planning approach integrating ecosystem management with urbanization processes. Interdisciplinary planning strategies and metrics will be developed, including strategies to extend forest eco-corridors into urban contexts. This demonstration master plan precedes development of a Research and Education Center for Interdisciplinary Urban National Forest Ecosystem Management—a national clearinghouse and research center for the management of communities and forests as one continuous habitat.

**Rogers: Habitat for Humanity of Benton County, Inc.** Commissioned 2005
Habitat Trails: from infill house to green neighborhood development with the Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering (BAEG), and Mark Boyer
UACDC led an interdisciplinary, public-private coalition to design a green neighborhood for Habitat for Humanity. Department of Architecture and BAEG students and faculty worked with UACDC to prepare home designs (at $55/ sq ft) and a green infrastructure that substitutes ecological engineering water management principles for conventional and costlier civil engineering strategies. This will be the first green residential development in Arkansas.
The project implements compact and dense development with greater land use efficiencies than that of surrounding suburban development. As a result the project did not meet the city zoning codes, which are based on suburban development standards. Working with attorneys and city public work departments to prepare a challenge report, UACDC sought and won 30 zoning variances from the Rogers City Council, who now endorses this as a model development. Rogers Mayor Steve Womack and Governor Huckabee use UACDC project images in their presentations on development in Arkansas. A secondary, but important, project outcome is the private civil engineering firm of record has adopted once unfamiliar ecological-based water management strategies into their practice. The Habitat neighborhood will also serve as a research platform for BAEG, who will conduct post-occupancy assessments of hydrological performance, including water quality output.

The Northwest Arkansas (NWA) Rail Transit Design Studio Initiated 2005
Beginning with a white paper in 2004, UACDC advanced the NWA rail study effort through an education initiative within the Department of Architecture, and complemented by several outreach initiatives. UACDC organized the department’s 2006 Spring upper division studios, hired faculty, and produced a publication: Planning Primer Transit-Oriented Development (TOD): Lifestyles and Ecologies. The three studios collectively explored the issue of TOD and its implication for NWA communities. Though design methodologies varied among studios, the initiative was intended to show NWA a set of planning possibilities stemming from rail transit—scenarios—and to establish a leadership role for the School of Architecture on important regional design and planning issues. The effort also introduced students to decision-making processes and design methodologies not typically addressed in the department.

The education effort was complemented by several outreach initiatives. UACDC was a presenter in The NWA Regional Rail Transit Forum held last fall, involving speakers nationwide. UACDC is also a major participant in the newly formed NWA Commuter Transit System Committee, heading a subcommittee on “visioning”. UACDC was asked to participate in a regional delegation that visited Washington DC in January 2006 to meet with Congressman Boozman and officials from the Federal Transit Administration to explore a feasibility study. UACDC also participated in a recent meeting between several committee members and partners of Patton Boggs LLP (Washington DC law firm specializing in large transportation projects), chaired by Secretary Rodney Slater.

Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Commissioned 2005
Campus Hydroscapes: Watershed as a Planning Platform for Campus Improvements in the University of Arkansas Athletic Valley with Audubon Arkansas, the Ecological Engineering Group, and Patricia Kucker
This collaboration stems from a demonstration grant awarded by the US Environmental Protection Agency (Audubon Arkansas as Principal Investigator) for stream improvements to the College Branch Tributary. UACDC completed a master plan for south campus in Fall 2005 that features combined transportation, housing, and watershed solutions.

Petit Jean Mountain: University of Arkansas System Initiated 2005
Campus Planning for the Winrock Discovery Center with Cromwell Architects Engineers, Inc.
The Winthrop Rockefeller estate on Petite Jean Mountain, consisting of the Rockefeller homestead, ranch, and former headquarters for Winrock International, is undergoing land use changes due to Winrock International’s departure. UACDC was part of a larger design team charged with preparing a design proposal decommissioning the ranch to become a campus with conference and educational facilities. The design challenge is to convert the existing ranch facilities into a hospitality and education center appropriate to a campus, without losing the ranch’s heritage that expresses the impact of Winthrop Rockefeller’s service to Arkansas.

**City of Monticello Master Plan: Monticello Economic Development Council**
Commissioned 2004
Place-Making Codes and Plans for Monticello, Arkansas with Valerie Hunt (formerly with DRDC) and Yi Lui (formerly with Center for Business and Economic Research) UACDC developed a place-based land ordinance (alternative to zoning) to facilitate creative development in the only southeastern delta city to experience growth. The project proposed design-based municipal growth instruments, integrating ecological and urban systems. As an alternative to traditional municipal zoning, UACDC developed form-based codes that employ patterns and design logics rather than legal code as urban development tools.

**Pulaski County: Two Rivers Park commissioned 2004**
Clearings, Clusters, and Cloisters: Arboreal Patterns for a Garden of Trees with landscape architecture faculty Laurie Fields and the Arkansas Forestry Commission A 140-acre section of the 1000-acre island park will be planted as an arboretum. The planting design highlights individual tree species, keeping in mind that lay observers often “fail to see the trees from the forest”. Didactic planting schemes explore patterns that switch between diverse and homogeneous systems, and typological spatial arrangements related to allees, bosques, and groves.

**Big Box Prototype Development: Wal-Mart, Inc. commissioned 2004**
Finding the Social in Big Box Retail
Wal-Mart and other discount retailers have saturated the suburban market and are now moving into metropolitan markets that resist standard big box development. UACDC devised a new pattern language for big box development, emphasizing community interface strategies between retailers and their public. The project simultaneously addressed the dynamics of private franchise development with the possibilities for civic development in public infrastructure.

**Bentonville: Pro Con, Inc. commissioned 2004**
Vendor Office Campus Plan for South Walton Plaza with Tim de Noble and Patricia Kucker
Currently, 200 Wal-Mart vendors move to northwest Arkansas per month, placing considerable development pressure on the commercial office market. Though seven buildings out of an anticipated thirty have been built in the South Walton Plaza complex without guidance from a master plan, the goal of the proposed campus plan is to program spatial relationships among the remaining 23 buildings. UACDC convinced the client, Pro Con, Inc., to add housing and retail program to the office campus.

**Fayetteville: Justice Center** commissioned 2004
UACDC was asked to study the conversion of a 1-story 150,000 s.f. Manufacturing facility into a new city of Fayetteville “Justice Center” amalgamating Police, Emergency, Fire, and Court facilities under one roof. The key challenge involved converting the large single-story metal factory into a civic building. UACDC prepared schematic design renderings for presentation to the Fayetteville City Council.

Fayetteville: Artist Live-Work Housing commissioned 2004
The twin goals of the project are to provide below market-rate housing for artists who could not otherwise maintain a presence in the downtown, and to enhance the cultural profile of Fayetteville. Downtown real estate values in Fayetteville are displacing populations that traditionally elevate the intellectual and creative index of communities. Programmatic requirements included ten residential lofts, 5,000 square feet of commercial gallery space and a 1,200 square foot café with 36 parking spaces for a site on an abandoned railroad right-of-way. An outdoor linear art garden would serve as commercial gallery access and double as a bike trail, extending Fayetteville’s rails-to-trails bicycle network. A key challenge involved adaptation of a turnkey metal building system designed for commercial purposes to accommodate housing.

OCPC/University of Arkansas: Main Gates, Historic Campus Inventory, Skyway Feasibility Study, and Miscellaneous Projects commissioned 2004
UACDC was asked to fulfill a wide range of tasks by various vice chancellors and Physical Plant (now Facilities Management).

Morrilton: Developing a Highway Ecology commissioned 2003
Developing a Highway Ecology is a planning model to address context-sensitive highway design. UACDC developed an index of generic objects and systems found along an ordinary highway, which constitutes the highway’s web of relations—or its ecology. The “Highway Ecology Matrix” is an index of those ordinary resources, and the material by which the highway may be reconfigured to realize community planning goals. Since these resources are standard budgeted allocations in highway development, Developing a Highway Ecology represents a modest, mainstream planning strategy.

City of Warren Greenway commissioned 2003
Riparian Meadows, Mounds, and Rooms with the Ecological Engineering Group (formerly the Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering), and Mesa Landscape Architects, Inc.
This study, a collaborative project between UACDC and the ecological Engineering Group is an effort to combine innovations in good stream design with community development. The combined effort represents a new planning model that leverages the individual contributions of each discipline, yielding synergistic improvements in both ecological and urban services. Since the stream links key community assets, landscapes and buildings, Riparian Meadows, Mounds, and Rooms is less the improvement of a strict riparian corridor and more a community development platform.

Fayetteville: Neighborhood Planning for New Town Creek Development commissioned 2003
UACDC was asked to submit an alternative residential subdivision development proposal to a conventional plan prepared for a sensitive greenfield site along New
Town Creek in south Fayetteville. UACDC structured the plan around best practices in watershed planning by decentralizing stormwater retention, preserving specimen hardwood trees, and substituting parking gardens for large parking lots. Street alignments respect existing drainage patterns without sacrificing connectivity to the surrounding neighborhood fabrics. Greater housing densities with a range of unit typologies were proposed to conserve sensitive wetland areas, providing the development with a greater range of landscapes and parks.

**Conway County: Parking Garden for Conway County Courthouse** commissioned 2003

Though a small lot for only twenty-eight spaces, the parking garden is situated in a prominent infill lot between a classical courthouse and the main street. The lot design is composed of two landscape rooms related to entry and exit. The entry room is a clipped hedge promenade accommodating pedestrian and vehicle movement alike on axis with the courthouse. The exit room is a container garden with a supergraphic paving surface imparting traffic flow information. The parking garden re-presents the courthouse to the city.

**Little Rock: Good Shepherd Ecumenical Retirement Center** commissioned 2002

Veranda Urbanism: Community Design and Aging in Place with Tim de Noble

The community and housing master plan for Good Shepherd Ecumenical Retirement Community (GSERC) provides a range of housing types responsive to varying physical capacities. Aging in place is a community-based planning initiative to align housing and health care services with the changing needs of seniors, avoiding the common problems of undercare and overcare. An 1100-unit residential community plan with mixed-use has been completed.

(For a full report of UACDC activities see Appendix G.)

**UACDC PHYSICAL RESOURCES**

Since 1996 UACDC offices have been located in an off-campus building only one block from the landmark Fayetteville downtown square. A renovated Firestone Tire Station designed by a School of Architecture faculty, the UACDC studio supports 4-6 full-time staff and up to 12 students per semester. (Plan; See appendix)

**Design/Build**

Design/build studios have been among the most popular and poignant of our educational offerings. These studios have been offered, during the fall/spring and summer semesters, dependent on faculty interest, availability, and on funding sources. Since the last accreditation visit we have completed a single family house in Fayetteville, have participated in the rehabilitation of Miss Gloria’s Kitchen in the Girt Town district of post-Katrina New Orleans (ongoing), and have complete two additional projects for special needs campers at Camp Aldersgate in Little Rock. We will offer design/build activities in the 2007/08 academic year. The focus will be on small-scale community projects with less strident technical demands than residences, similar in scale to our projects at Camp Aldersgate. This type of project is more appropriately suited to the cadence of the academic calendar and provides a greater range of experiences in the field for our students.

The upcoming design/build studio is being conducted by Assistant Professor Michael Hughes who is spearheading our effort to establish a design/build initiative for the school.
The goal of this effort is to sustain hands-on service learning activities for students in our programs, while realizing economies associated with the centralization of these efforts.

Mission:
The University of Arkansas Design-Build Program will provide a unique learning environment for students interested in a comprehensive, hands-on approach to design education. The paradigm of Design-Build, in which students learn by doing, extends architectural education beyond conventional academic boundaries to engage the inherent complexities associated with making architecture in the real world.

Hands-on, interdisciplinary service learning provides an unparalleled opportunity for students to acquire direct knowledge and experience in all aspects related to design, civic outreach, and construction. In addition to the focus on full-scale construction, this pedagogical model introduces students to the inter-personal and inter-professional nature of contemporary architectural practice. Students learn to work with clients, community groups, code compliance officials, craftsmen, funding agencies, donors, building consultants, and material suppliers on projects that integrate design and construction with civic, environmental, and social responsibility. In addition, the Design-Build program will provide the venue for a wide range of research into ecological and sustainable technologies, emerging housing trends, new construction processes, and alternative materials.

Primary Goals:
- To immerse students in a hands-on learning environment that combines critical design and construction skills in a socially responsible manner.
- To develop leadership qualities and civic awareness by instilling the social ethics of professionalism, volunteerism, individual responsibility, and community service.
- To focus on the unremarkable and often forgotten places adjacent to the lives of underserved people and create experiential delight out of small-scale design opportunities.
- To enhance the built environment in and around Arkansas with architectural spaces that provide pragmatic functions, promote play, and exhibit a social and environmental conscience.
- To work with the UACDC (University of Arkansas Community Design Center) in leveraging and applying existing resources and networks in order to expand the scope of service learning at the University of Arkansas.

Areas of Research:
- **Sustainability**
  Passive + Active Solar Technology, Wind Power, Water Conservation and Collection, Green Roof Systems, Dept. of Energy’s Solar Decathlon Competition, Tectonic Landscapes
- **Housing**
  Modular + Prefab Construction, Affordable, Migrant, Adaptive Reuse, Emergency Shelter
- **Technology**
Production Techniques, Industry Collaboration, Computer Controlled Equipment, New Materials + Manufacturing Methodologies, Healthy Environments, Digital Prototyping

- **Outreach**
  Participate in the CityBuild Consortium’s post-Katrina reconstruction efforts, Design and Build projects that contribute to underserved citizens. Partner with local government and non-profit organizations, such as Habitat for Humanity, on projects that improve the public realm.

**EVIDENCE OF OPPORTUNITIES TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDENT PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES, HONORS SOCIETIES, AND OTHER CAMPUS-WIDE ACTIVITIES:**

At the campus level, a number of architecture students have taken leadership roles in residence life (dormitory) activities, new student orientation, the student ambassador program for the Office of Admissions and the “Rock Camp” program for entering students. Our students also enjoy representation on the Student Alumni Board and the University Greek Council. Through the AIAS chapter, students work with the university Student Government Association and with the Office of Student Leadership and Involvement.

**Student Organizations**

The School has a small, but active, group of student professional organizations, the majority of which are interdisciplinary, involving students from Landscape Architecture and allied disciplines: AIAS, Tau Sigma Delta Honor Society, and CSI. Each organization is advised by a faculty member or a local practitioner.

**AIAS**

The AIAS Chapter contributes to the intellectual and social life of the program through its participation in an annual Beaux Arts Ball and by hosting an annual student versus faculty softball game and BBQ to begin each year. It seeks to encourage a well rounded lifestyle by providing sports tournaments, social hours with practicing architects, tours of construction project, and tailgating events for the campus football games. The AIAS Chapter hosts small design competitions which encourage students to utilize their design skills outside of studio. The AIAS officers assist in teaching a first year class titled Leadership by Design which provides peer mentoring and tutoring to enhance the first year experience. The AIAS Chapter hosts workshops which provide students additional resources on subjects such as portfolio design and IDP training. In addition, AIAS participates with other campus organizations which encourage students to make a difference on campus. Its officers and members attend Forum and Grass Roots meetings with support from the program. The AIAS Chapter plans yearly trips to the Southern AIAS Quad Conference which takes place in Miami Florida this year and the AIA Arkansas annual meeting held in Rogers Arkansas this year. University of Arkansas AIAS officers serve on AIAS national committees such as the Elections Committee. A member of AIAS serves on the Dean’s Student Advisory Board and a member from each year level assists the AIAS by helping schedule events around projects and ensuring adequate supplies are available to students on time. The AIAS also plans to double its membership this year from 35 to 70 members.

**Tau Sigma Delta**

Tau Sigma Delta is the Honor Society for Architecture and Allied Arts. It is also a service oriented organization, for the college and community. Students who are in
their third year design studio or above, have a 3.0 GPA and are in the upper 20 percent of their class, and exhibit good character are eligible to be invited to become members.

The Chapter has inducted 76 new members in the period 2002-2007. Activities have included sponsoring the Derby Race during Archiweek (this lasted until the infamous crash into the Engineering Building in 2003); co-sponsoring the lecture series during at least one week of Archiweek; co-sponsoring a Halloween costume party; providing tutorial sessions for School of Architecture students; participation in “Make a Difference Day” service projects; and organizing, promoting and securing funding for a display of School of Architecture student work in the Student Union.

At the campus level, a number of architecture students have taken leadership roles in residence life (dormitory) activities, new student orientation, and the “Connections” program for entering students. Our students also enjoy representation on the Student Alumni Board and the University Greek Council. Through the AIAS chapter, students work with the university Associated Student Government and with the Office of Student Affairs. In addition, two representatives from School of Architecture serve on the Associated Student Government Senate.

DESCRIPTION OF THE POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR ACCESSING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES:

Evaluation Procedures Summary
The Department of Architecture seeks excellence in its faculty and staff appointments and programs in accordance with the accepted standards of the larger scholarly community of which it is a part. Faculty performance is evaluated each year at the departmental level. Department policies on faculty performance are designed to recognize and reward meritorious accomplishments by salary raises, promotion, and the granting of tenure. Faculty members may request consideration for tenure and/or promotion through the Architecture Department Head, who may also recommend deliberation of such actions. Requests for tenure and/or promotion are reviewed by the department’s tenured faculty, or tenured faculty at or above the rank to which the applicant aspires, who advises the department head regarding the merits of the application. Attainment of tenure and/or promotion requires a high standard of achievement in teaching, research, scholarship, and/or creative activity, and service; demonstrated collegiality; and a clear indication that such a performance level will be maintained over a career as a faculty member at this university.

Initial Appointment
The Department of Architecture is composed of a faculty which supports the mission, pedagogy, skills and interests of the department and its curriculum, and reflects the diversity of the larger community of architectural educators and scholars, researchers, and practitioners. The department head, following the receipt of a recommendation by the appropriate search committee and subject to the approval of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, will forward recommendations on initial appointments to the dean. All searches are conducted in accordance with procedures established by the university’s Office of Affirmative Action. Each faculty member, on appointment, is expected to engage in a program of personal scholarship, research and/or creative activity, and service appropriate to his/her area of specialization within the discipline of architecture.
Annual Reviews
The Head of the Department of Architecture, in cooperation with the Dean of the School of Architecture, initiates and conducts annual review of all faculty in accordance with procedures set forth in the department personnel documents, the University of Arkansas Faculty Handbook, and established Board of Trustees Policies. All tenured and tenure-track faculty as well as continuing faculty in clinical appointments are reviewed. The department head’s annual review of faculty members takes into consideration (1) performance criteria that support the teaching, research/creative activity, and service missions of the academic unit as well as foster personal professional development of the faculty member; (2) self-evaluation by the faculty member; (3) peer review by a faculty committee; and (4) student evaluation of teaching. As part of this process of evaluation, the department head meets with each faculty member at the outset of the fall to review of assignments in teaching and service, and establishment of goals in research, scholarly activity, and creative work for the forthcoming academic year. Increasingly, the department head’s annual evaluation involves adjustment of the “normal” distribution of effort to accommodate faculty research. A follow-up meeting is conducted in the spring as a forum for review and evaluation of performance in teaching, service, and research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work for the calendar year. In addition to participating in the above-referenced meeting, each faculty receives a written statement from her/his department head detailing strengths and discussing areas requiring improvement. The written statements documenting annual review of faculty performance are requisite components of each faculty member’s dossier for promotion and tenure applications.

Pre-Tenure Review
A formal review of each non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member will be conducted at the end of his/her third year of the probationary period toward tenure. The purpose of the review is to assess the candidate’s progress toward a positive recommendation for tenure, and to provide the candidate with assessment and concerning his/her personal professional development in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity, and his/her contributions to the teaching and service missions of the department. This review is conceived as an intrinsic facet of the mentoring of junior faculty, and is conducted in a proactive and supportive manner. In accordance with procedures outlined in the Personnel Document, a mentoring program has been established to support tenure-track faculty and others who are still in the early stages of their careers.

Tenure and Promotion
The criteria followed in making tenure and promotion decisions is identical to the performance criteria followed in annual review procedures except that for tenure and promotion considerations, the evaluation package must contain documentation for all accomplishments since the applicant’s tenure track start date and/or date of last promotion. In addition, all tenure and promotion decisions involve external reviews of the candidate’s dossier. In applications for tenure, the Department of Architecture tenured faculty constitutes the review committee; in cases of promotion, the Department of Architecture tenured faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires constitutes the review committee.

The award of tenure assumes satisfaction of university and department criteria. Additional overarching questions must be answered affirmatively if tenure and/or promotion are to be awarded:
1. Does the individual possess the specialized expertise needed to carry out the goals and objectives of the School and Department and the role for which he or she was hired?
2. Does the individual add a unique and valuable ingredient to the faculty community?
3. Has the individual demonstrated genuine quality as a teacher?
4. Does the individual relate well to both students and faculty colleagues?
5. Is the individual genuinely committed to achieving and maintaining a high standard of excellence in all academic endeavors?
6. Has the individual demonstrated competence as a scholar or as a creative artist?
7. Will the individual represent the school and university in a creditable manner?
8. Is the award of tenure in the best interest of the school, the department, and the university?

EVIDENCE OF THE PROGRAM’S FACILITATION OF FACULTY RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES SINCE THE PREVIOUS VISIT:

During the period since the last accreditation, Department of Architecture faculty have been active in cultivating critical practices in design and in fulfilling the university’s emphasis on research and scholarship as a key component of strengthening the institution’s and the school’s academic quality and reputation. Moreover, in the School of Architecture, research, scholarship, creative activity and service to the community are understood as foundations for attaining excellence in teaching. This school emphasis on the mutual reinforcement between a faculty member’s teaching, research (or Creative Activity) and service to the community are understood as foundations for attaining excellence in teaching. This school emphasis on the mutual reinforcement between a faculty member’s teaching, research (or Creative Activity) and service has been echoed and reinforced by Provost Smith under the rubric of “The Integrated Scholar,” which he has written about using one of our faculty members as an illustration in several of his web-based academic essays “All Things Academic.”

The School of Architecture has encouraged and facilitated the research, scholarship and creative activities of the faculty in the following ways:

Since 2003, the dean has provided research funding in the amount of $2500 per year to all full time permanent faculty including department heads. These funds are administered by each department head and may used for any purpose that materially furthers the faculty member’s research agenda. Until this academic year, the fund may be carried over one year. This year a different policy is in place, hopefully on a temporary basis because of the university’s mandatory budget turn back implemented fall 2006.

Since the last accreditation visit the department head has routinely given tenure-track architecture faculty members teaching release time in order to allow them more concentrated focus on their research/scholarship or creative activity. This has materially enhanced their submissions for tenure and promotion.

Since 2005, the dean and the department head have been more aggressively seeking startup research funding for new tenure track faculty hires. In 2005, we received $125,000 in one time funding for research from the university for a new associate professor; in 2006, we received for a new assistant professor hire $30,000 in research funds from the university.
Since well before the 2002 accreditation visit, the School of Architecture has fully supported travel to conferences and academic symposia for faculty presenting papers or for those having substantive roles to play in these events.

Since 2004, the dean has been actively encouraging the director of the University of Arkansas Press to publish works on architecture and landscape architecture, especially works by our faculty. These efforts are beginning to bear fruit. One tenure track faculty member has received a contract for the press to publish his book on universal design; another has been in discussion with the director about a project; a third has seen the press publish the inaugural issue of his new academic journal, APPX, this summer; and a fourth is in line to begin discussions with the Press. The press will also publish in 2008 the three lecture manuscript for Peter Eisenman’s September lectures at the school in a book entitled Close Readings in a Media Culture, the first publication in what we hope will become a high profile series on architecture.

A formal faculty mentoring program has been in place for over a decade designed to promote mentoring of junior faculty by senior faculty members. However, an informal process of mentoring, growing out of shared or parallel research interests and interpersonal relationships has proven to be a more effective, desirable means of mentorship.

Off-Campus Duty Assignments and Unpaid Leaves Of Absence
The University of Arkansas awards Off Campus Duty Assignments that allow eligible faculty and administrators to pursue an approved project while being relieved of teaching and administrative duties. Faculty members who have completed six years of continuous full-time employment with the university or who have completed six years of continuous full-time service since a previous Off-Campus Duty assignment may apply for this privilege. Applications must describe the project that the applicant wishes to undertake, and its value to both the individual and the academic unit. To be approved, a proposed assignment must be consonant with the needs, objectives, and mission of the School of Architecture (See University of Arkansas Faculty Handbook, 5-6, “Policies Governing Faculty Service” and Academic Policy Series 1435.40). University policies also make provision for the award of one-year unpaid leaves of absence to foster personal professional development or to allow faculty and staff to take advantage of the federal Family and Medical Leave Act.

Faculty granted off campus duty assignments since the last accreditation have enhanced the school by undertaking projects that integrate teaching with practice and/or scholarship.

**Professor Marlon Blackwell**, Off Campus Duty Assignment, Fall 2007 and Spring 2008
Research into broadening understanding of architectural space, in buildings that are conceived as the setting for experiences that resist the defining and limiting prejudices of the scenographic, space that deflects tendencies toward the pictorial, and that recognizes the necessity for translation of heterogeneous, multivalent aspects of experience into immanent form. Includes a trip to Mali, as well as a position as a Visiting Professor at Auburn University in the Spring of 2008.

**Associate Professor Kim Sexton**, Off Campus Duty Assignment, Fall 2006
Research focusing on the loggia as an architectural type. In addition to completing her book manuscript, Loggia Culture: Practices of Space in Italy 1200-1600, Prof.
Sexton has delivered the following papers based on her research: “Untainted Transactions: Loggias and the Social Space of Accumulation” at the National Society of Architectural Historians, and “The Spectacle of Sociability: The Loggia as Theater of Urbanitas” at the College Art Association in New York, NY.

Professor Davide Vitali, Off Campus Duty Assignment, Spring 2003
Research focusing on current theories regarding the effect of digital work within the discipline of architecture; continuing education in the use CAD and other graphic software; and a required professional course in construction site safety.

Professor David Glasser, Off Campus Duty Assignment, Spring 2002
A teaching assignment at Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey, and research focusing on self-help housing in the context of earthquake disasters, an area of study particularly relevant to his role as the Director of the University of Arkansas Community Design Center.

Professor Ethel Goodstein, Off Campus Duty Assignment, Spring 2002
Research focusing on design and representation of sacred space in the United States relative to major cultural shifts that have influenced religion in the twentieth century. Prof. Goodstein has delivered the following papers based on her research: “Gothic Revival or Gothic Survival? Reflections on Modernism and Historicism in the Fin de Siècle French Church,” at the Annual Meeting of the Nineteenth-Century Studies Association, the Southeast Society of Architectural Historians, the Hawaii International Conference on Arts and Humanities, and the College Art Association, New York, NY.

Opportunities For Acquiring New Skills And Knowledge:
In addition to pursuing personal professional development, faculty and staff have taken advantage of programs sponsored by the school, university, and other entities to acquire new skills and knowledge. A representative example of these include:

- AIA Development Officers and Dean's Training Sessions, 2002-2007
- CASE Annual Conference for Senior Publications Professionals
- "Our Campus: Building a More Inclusive University of Arkansas" 2006 International Association for Administrative Professionals Conference, 2007

Teaching and Faculty Support Center Activities:
The Teaching and Faculty Support Center (TFSC) was established in 1992 to assist the faculty with their scholarship of teaching and to act as a resource center for new teaching techniques and programs.

The center functions independently of the individual colleges and is served by an Advisory Council composed of representatives from across campus.

With a view toward fostering excellence in teaching, the TFSC provides a central facility to assist departments, faculty, and teaching assistants in the continued improvement of learning and teaching. It functions as a resource clearinghouse for addressing instructional issues through a variety of instruction programs, including peer consultation, mentoring, and reading groups.
School of Architecture faculty (most recently Professor Ethel Goodstein-Murphree) have successfully competed for grants to attend the TFSC’s annual Teaching Camps, a retreat devoted to discussing teaching techniques and strategies. The TFSC is especially proactive in acclimating new faculty to the campus through the sponsorship of lunches during the semester and an annual bus trip which offers new faculty an opportunity to tour the state and learn about the constituency that the university serves.

Current Department of Architecture members of the Teaching Academy are Gregory Herman (elected 2005), Ethel Goodstein-Murphree, Jeff Shannon, and Emeritus Professors Murray Smart, John Williams, and Cyrus Sutherland.

**FACILITATION OF FACULTY RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES:**

Architecture faculty have attained national accolades for accomplishments in design, assumed leadership roles in professional and learned societies, developed precedent-setting research, and contributed to the stewardship of our community. The following examples highlight the quality and diversity of the faculty’s contributions to the discipline. (See Appendix G for faculty publications and awards.)

### Summary of Architecture Faculty Scholarly and Creative Activities Since 2002 and the Amount of Funding for Travel in Support of These Efforts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books (by or about)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed Articles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non refereed Articles</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Lectures</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed Papers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Projects</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors and Awards</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures/Faculty Travel</td>
<td>$13,972</td>
<td>$34,901</td>
<td>$27,878</td>
<td>$19,024</td>
<td>$27,678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPORT OF ATTENDANCE AT SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS**

The program has generously supported faculty participation in scholarly and professional meetings; since the last accreditation visit all faculty requests for department funding to attendance have been honored. A representative year-to-year listing of faculty participation, supported by the program, in meetings of professional and scholarly societies follows.

**06-07**

- **Ćatavić - Hughes, Selma.** Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture National Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.
- **De Noble, Tim.** Arkansas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects State Convention, Hot Springs, AR.
- **De Noble, Tim.** Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture National Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.
• **De Noble, Tim.** Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture Administrators Conference, Phoenix, AZ.
• **Goodstein-Murphree, Ethel.** Annual Conference of the Southeast Chapter Society of Architectural Historians, Auburn, AL.
• **Goodstein-Murphree, Ethel.** Annual conference of the Vernacular Architecture Forum, Savannah, GA.
• **Goodstein-Murphree, Ethel.** Mid-America Conference on History, hosted by the Department of History at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.
• **Herman, Gregory.** New Architecture Forum.” Savannah GA.
• **Hughes, Michael.** Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture National Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.
• **Hughes, Michael.** Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture Meeting, Los Angeles, CA.
• **Rotolo, Chuck.** Building Technology Educators Symposium, Univ. of Maryland.
• **Sexton, Kim.** Society of Architectural Historians, Pittsburgh, PA.
• **Sexton, Kim.** College Art Association in New York, NY.
• **Smith, Korydon.** International Symposium on Universal Design and Visitability: From Accessibility to Zoning, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
• **Smith, Korydon.** Poster presented at the 37th Annual Conference of the Environmental Design Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

05-06

• **De Noble, Tim.** Arkansas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects State Convention, Fort Smith, AR.
• **De Noble, Tim.** Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture Administrators Conference, Baltimore, MD.
• **De Noble, Tim.** American Institute of Architects National Convention, Los Angeles, CA.
• **Goodstein-Murphree, Ethel.** Annual Conference, Southeast Chapter, Society of Architectural Historians, Fort Worth, TX.
• **Goodstein-Murphree, Ethel.** Annual Conference of the Southeast College Art Conference, Little Rock, AR.
• **Goodstein-Murphree, Ethel.** Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians Savannah, GA.
• **Goodstein-Murphree, Ethel.** Annual Conference of the Vernacular Architecture Forum, New York, NY.
• **Herman, Gregory.** National Conference of the Western Social Science Association, Phoenix, AZ.
• **Herman, Gregory.** Grant Institute Workshop, Little Rock, AR.
• **Sexton, Kim S.** Southeast Society of Architectural Historians, Ft. Worth, TX.
• **Sexton, Kim S.** Renaissance Society of America, San Francisco, CA.
• **Sexton, Kim S.** Sewanee Medieval Colloquium at the University of the South, Sewanee, TN.
• **Smith, Korydon.** National Conference on the Beginning Design Student, Iowa State University, Ames, IA.

04-05

• **Goodstein-Murphree, Ethel.** Annual Conference of the Southeast Medieval Association, Charleston, SC.
• **Goodstein-Murphree, Ethel S.** Architectural Research Centers Consortium (ARCC) National Conference on Architectural Research, Jackson, MS.
• **Herman, Gregory.** Cranbrook Seminar on Case Studies, Bloomfield Hills, MI. (Baum Grant for travel)
• **Kucker, Patricia C.**. Beginning Design Student Conference, University of San Antonio, TX.
• **Messadi, Tahar.** Ghost, Brian Mackay-Lyons Design-Build Seminar, Nova Scotia.
• **Smith, Korydon H.** National Conference on the Beginning Design Student, University of Texas, San Antonio, San Antonio, TX.
• **Smith, Korydon H.** International Arts and Humanities Conference, Honolulu, HI
• **Sexton, Kim S.** Society of Architectural Historians, Vancouver, BC.
• **Terry, Laura M.** Hawaii International Conference on the Arts and Humanities, Honolulu, HI

**03-04**
• **De Noble, Tim.** Arkansas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects State Convention.
• **Goodstein, Ethel S.** Annual Meeting of the Southeast Chapter, Society of Architectural Historians (SESAH), October 2, 2003, Savannah, GA.
• **Goodstein, Ethel S.** Annual Conference of the Nineteenth-Century Studies Association, St. Louis, MO.
• **Goodstein, Ethel S.** Joint Meeting of the American Culture Association and Association for Popular Culture, San Antonio TX.
• **Herman, Gregory.** Research**, Southeast Society of Architectural Historians, Savannah, GA.
• **Humphries, John.** ACSA Southwest Regional Conference, Houston, TX.
• **Humphries, John.** Hawaii International Arts and Humanities Conference, Honolulu, HI.
• **Humphries, John.** ACSA Beginning Design Conference, Hampton, Virginia.
• **Rudzinski, Russell.** Beginning Design Conference, Hampton University, April 2004.
• **Sexton, Kim S.** Southeast Society of Architectural Historians Annual Meeting, Savannah, GA.
• **Sexton, Kim S.** Southeastern Medieval Association, Fayetteville, AR.
• **Smith, Korydon.** 4th International Utopian Studies Conference, European University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain.
• **Smith, Korydon** Design Communications Association Conference, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA.
• **Smith, Korydon.** 20th National Conference on the Beginning Design Student, Hampton, VA.
• **Smith, Korydon.** 20th National Conference on the Beginning Design Student, Hampton, VA.
• **Terry, Laura.** ACSA National Conference, Miami, FL.
• **Terry, Laura.** Southeast Society of Architectural Historians Conference, Savannah, GA.

**02-03**
• **Goodstein, Ethel S.** Annual Conference of the College Art Association, New York, NY.
• **Goodstein, Ethel S.** Annual Conference of the Southeast Society of Architectural Historians, Mobile, AL.
• **Herman, Gregory.** Annual Conference of the Southeast Society of Architectural Historians, Mobile, AL.
- **Rudzinski, Russell.** Ghost 5, Brian Mackay-Lyons Design-Build Seminar, Nova Scotia.
- **Rudzinski, Russell.** Weaving, ACSA East Central Regional Conference, Muncie, IN.
- **Sexton, Kim S.** Annual Meeting of the Southeast Society of Architectural Historians, Mobile, AL.
- **Sexton, Kim S.** Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, Denver, CO.
- **Smith, Korydon**. H. 19th National Conference on the Beginning Design Student, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK.
- **Terry, Laura.** Annual Meeting of the Southeast Chapter of the Society of Architectural Historians, University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL.

**EVIDENCE OF HOW FACULTY REMAIN CURRENT IN THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF CHANGING DEMANDS OF PRACTICE AND LICENSURE:**

As indicated in the above discussions of faculty research, scholarship and creative activity, faculty are engaged in a variety of activities, which enable them to remain current in their areas of specialization in the discipline. For those members of the faculty who are registered professionals, Continuing Education Units can be obtained through the school’s Distinguished Lecture Series. The school funds faculty participation in the state and national conventions of the American Institute of Architects where continuing education requirements for organization membership and licensure is provided. In addition to supporting faculty attendance to conferences and continuing education forums, the School of Architecture, along with The University of Arkansas Library Special Collections hosted *The Architecture and Landscapes of Arkansas: A Heritage of Distinction* in the spring of 2007. Department of Architecture faculty also offer continuing education opportunities, lecturing at the school and in Little Rock through the lecture series sponsored by the Central Arkansas Section of the Arkansas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. A number of faculty have also participated as consultants in A.R.E. preparation seminars organized by the Associate members of the Arkansas AIA.
3.8 PHYSICAL RESOURCES

General Description:
The School of Architecture has on-campus facilities in two buildings: Memorial Hall, which is occupied in part by the Department of Landscape Architecture, and Vol Walker Hall, which houses the Department of Architecture together with the school’s administrative offices and support staffs. Originally constructed by the Works Progress Administration as the University Library, Vol Walker Hall is a substantial neo-classical revival building that has been placed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is also held in high esteem by the campus community and University of Arkansas and School of Architecture alumni alike. Prior to occupying Vol Walker Hall in 1968, Architecture was located in the University of Arkansas Fine Arts Center, designed by Edward Durell Stone. The school also maintains off-campus facilities in Fayetteville for the University of Arkansas Community Design Center, in Hot Springs for Garvan Woodland Gardens, and in Rome and Mexico City to house its international study programs. In addition, the department’s library holdings are kept in the Fine Arts Library.

Vol Walker Hall
Design studios, lecture and classroom facilities, academic support spaces, and faculty offices comprise the department’s principle spaces in Vol Walker Hall. First-year students have their studio space in the basement. Fifth-year students have a studio space on the ground floor adjoining the building lobby and on the third floor above the two small classrooms. A public review space, the Crit Cube, was added in 1993. The 135-seat Shollmier Lecture Hall is located on the north side of the lobby. The former library reading room on the second floor provides studio space for second, third and fourth year design studios. Class rooms 202 and 205, as well as the main gallery, provide space for seminars and project reviews.

All students enrolled in studios have their own desks, and a security system affords students and faculty 24-hour access to the building. Faculty offices are distributed throughout the building providing students with ready access to the faculty. Six new offices were built above the advising center and department head’s office when the building was renovated to improve building fire egress. Vol Walker is fully wired for Ethernet access with drops in all faculty and administrative offices, studios, labs and classrooms.

December 2005 marked the completion of the construction work inside and outside of Vol Walker Hall. Funded in large part by over $3M in grants from the Arkansas Natural and Cultural Resources Council and in part by the university, the renovation included new roofing and waterproofing, skylights repair, exterior stone cleaning and joint repair, the addition of 1500 square feet of new studio space and another 1500 square feet for six new faculty offices, and code compliance work. The code compliance work, responding directly to our 2002 NAAB Team Report, included the addition of three major fire stairs, new security and fire alarms as well as several other smaller code-related modifications. The project architect was John K. Mott, FAIA, U of A BArch. ‘60, a principal with the Washington, D.C. firm of John Milner Associates, Inc. The architectural drawings documenting these interior changes and additions are included in the appendix.

In addition to housing architecture design studios, a lecture hall, classrooms, faculty offices, administrative suites, academic support spaces, the dean’s office, and the Advising Center, Vol Walker Hall provides generous public spaces for galleries and for gatherings. The ground floor has a small, securable gallery space to complement an unsecured large gallery on the second floor. Spaces dedicated to informational
resources and program enhancement also occupy Vol Walker. The C. Murray Smart Visual Media Center, located on the third floor in the former “stack” area of the building, houses the slide and video library, photographic facilities, and print resources. A wood shop, offering a basic array of power and hand tools for model construction and larger scale (wood) projects, spaces for our CNC Router and several laser cutters, and a small photographic dark room are all situated in the basement. The uppermost floors of the former stack area are dedicated to project archives. (See Appendix C for plans)

Garvan Woodland Gardens
This beautiful woodland botanical garden with a modest supporting endowment was a testamentary gift of Ms. Verna C. Garvan. The garden staff has been implementing its master plan for the last 6 years. The garden encompasses 210 wooded acres with 4 1/2 miles of shoreline on Lake Hamilton in Hot Springs National Park, Hot Springs, Arkansas. The Department of Landscape Architecture has a very strong relationship to the gardens, sending interns and students there on a regular basis and organizing annual symposia there as well.

University of Arkansas Community Design Center
The University of Arkansas Community Design Center (UACDC) offers a design studio to architecture students each semester of the academic year. Located in downtown Fayetteville near the town square, the UACDC has served the campus, the city, the region, the state and beyond. Over the last four years, the staff of the UACDC and the students enrolled in studios there have had a remarkable track record in garnering national and international recognition for their work. (See appendix C for plans)

Rome Study Center
The Rome Study Center is located in a facility near the Palazzo Cancelleria on the Corso Vittorio Emanuele and very near Piazza Navona. The space affords generous areas for studios, lecture rooms, and support spaces including library and computer facilities while maintaining proximity to many of the city’s most significant historic sites and buildings. (See Appendix C for plans)

Mexico City
Through the cooperation of the Barragán Foundation we are very privileged to lease the Casa Museo, the former studio annex of Luis Barragán, for its Mexico summer program. Reviews and lectures are held in the main studio of the Barragán house complex. Depending on the number of participants we also use this space for studio overflow.

Description of Changes under Construction, Funded or Proposed:
Vol Walker Hall has heating, ventilating and air conditioning problems, wiring problems, suffers water leakage in the basement, and has acoustical problems that undermine the use of many of our public review spaces. Lecture and classroom facilities are adequate, with projection equipment having been recently upgraded. The school suffers from not having a single space in the building that can accommodate our entire student body. In fact we are almost 270 seats short; i.e. we can only seat about 34% of our student body. It is therefore often necessary to schedule major public lectures in other nearby campus buildings. On an annual basis, we continue to make known our facility and space needs to the upper administration. They recognize a major renovation of the building is very much needed and is on their high priority list for renovation. However, there is neither a
definitive timetable nor a funding commitment that we are aware of for launching a
major renovation. In the meantime, the Dean and Development Director of the School
of Architecture are proceeding with the planning of a fundraising initiative to be
launched as early as fall 2007 to develop funding to assist in renovation and/or to help
fund a modest addition (approximately 25,000 s.f.) to Vol Walker Hall.

3.9 INFORMATION RESOURCES

Type of Library
The Fine Arts Library is the campus’s principal repository for printed materials on
architecture, landscape architecture, and the fine arts. This branch library is located in
the Fine Arts Complex (Edward Durell Stone, 1954) near the entrance to Mullins Library,
the main library of the University, and the center of the campus, a short walk from Vol
Walker Hall. Architecture students enjoy nearly direct access to Mullins Library through its
east door, situated less than 100 feet from the rear entrance to Vol Walker Hall. The C.
Murray Smart Video Center in Vol Walker Hall houses the School of Architecture’s slide
and video collections.

THE FINE ARTS LIBRARY
Library Collections
The cooperative efforts of the Fine Arts Librarian and the architecture faculty ensure that
our library holdings grow concert with changes in the architecture curriculum, and in
support of the teaching, scholarly, and creative activities of students and faculty. In spite
of unrelenting inflation in the costs of serials, book acquisition budgets have remained
level, with slight increases in funding. Although there have been no large-scale cut
backs in serials subscriptions, and undertaking that reduced periodical holdings in the
early 1990s, we still cannot expect to increase serials holdings from university funds. We
believe there is sufficient depth, and increasing breadth, in both the book and serials
collections to adequately support the program taught, but we will be able to maintain
current and retrospective scope in the collection on if the current level of funding is, at a
minimum, sustained.

The Fine Arts Library’s collections are supported by four primary sources. First, there is an
Architecture monographs allocation that is monitored and maintained by the Fine Arts
Librarian. The architecture Library Representative, in consultation with the architecture
department head and the architecture faculty, submits requests for library materials to
be purchased to the Fine Arts Librarian on a regular, ongoing, basis. The Fine Arts
Librarian also oversees expenditures related to serials acquisitions that support the
Architecture academic program. The University Libraries also maintains two approval
plans with the book vendors Yankee Book Peddler and Worldwide Books. Both of these
vendors supply books on architecture topics on a regular, ongoing, basis via established
academic approval plan profiles. Last the Fine Arts Librarian has a discretionary fund for
the purchase of architecture and art reference materials.

The majority of firm-ordered monograph acquisitions are faculty driven, and our principle
objective in library collection development activities is to provide direct support to our
teaching mission. Not only do we maintain depth and currency in the areas of design,
history, theory and criticism, and professional practice, we also have endeavored to
build up collections in response to on-going evolution of our architectural technology
sequence, to enhance the curriculum in professional elective courses, and in support of
faculty research. We have, to a lesser extent, worked to represent interdisciplinary and cultural studies frameworks for architectural inquiry in our collection.

The Fine Arts Library has sufficient collections to meet the needs of the program and the number of students enrolled. The architecture collection in the Fine Arts Library contains 10,587 volumes classified "NA" by the Library of Congress Classification Scheme, which represents a 10% increase in holdings since the last accreditation. At the end of academic year 2006-07, 13,987 volumes comprised the total architecture holdings between both the Fine Arts Library and the university’s main academic library, Mullins Library. The Fine Arts Library also maintains a Reference Collection (a non-circulating collection), that holds important reference sets such as the Garland Architectural Archives series. A small collection of rare books is housed in the Fine Arts Library’s Rare Book Room. Access to this collection is controlled by permission of library staff. Additionally, Mullins Library holds approximately 60 DVD’s and videos on architecture topics.

The University of Arkansas Libraries Special Collections Department owns several important archival collections related to the architecture discipline: the Fay Jones Papers, the Edward Durrell Stone Papers, the James and Belle Dinwiddle Architectural Drawings collection (1926-1956), and the archives of architects of regional renown, including Fayetteville designer Warren Seagreaves. The Fay Jones Papers collections consists of office project files, professional records, certificates, correspondence, notes pertaining to lectures, symposia, and juries, sketch books, and 75 flat file drawers of project drawings. The Edward Durrell Stone Papers collection includes many kinds of records of Stone’s personal and professional activities, such as files of correspondence, manuscript drafts of his speeches and writings, and an estimated 20,000 drawings. Approximately 400 architectural projects are documented in this collection. For more information on these collections, please see the University of Arkansas Libraries Special Collections’ website at http://libinfo.uark.edu/specialcollections/default.asp.

The University Libraries subscribes to several general full-text databases as well as the standard online and print architectural periodical indexes. The full-text databases include Proquest Direct and Ebsco’s Academic Search Premier, and Lexis Nexis Academic Universe. Development of our serials collection, however, has been at a standstill since an enforced cutback in subscriptions during fiscal year 2006-2007. We have been unable to obtain new serials that have recently begun publication. However, the University Libraries has made great strides in adding online, full-text titles to our online catalog, InfoLinks. For example, users searching for the journal Building Design and Construction in Infolinks would find a link to the online, full-text version of this title available in Proquest Direct. The University Libraries e-journal collection consists of approximately 20,000 titles, 51 of these cover architecture topics. To review a complete list of e-journals that are available through the Libraries’ online catalog, please see http://libinfo.uark.edu/eresources/ejournals/default.asp. The impact of electronic sources notwithstanding, we are making every effort to underscore the importance of serials as a vital means for keeping students and faculty current with developments in our discipline, and as the strategic plan indicates, new sources of funding for these critical resources are being sought.

The Fine Arts Library’s collections are organized with the Library of Congress Classification Scheme, and the University Libraries Technical Services catalogs the Fine Arts Library’s materials using the national network, OCLC, as well as the standard record format USMARC, and the AACR2 cataloging guidelines and standards. New materials are
catalogued within two weeks to one month of receipt. All items appear in our online catalog at the time of ordering and upon receipt so rush requests can be made. Rush items are cataloged and made available to the patron within 24 hours.

The Fine Arts Library does take care to protect and repair materials to the best of its ability. In the Fine Arts Library, a locked storage area holds many items that require special protection because of their rarity, expense, value, age, or condition. The University Libraries uses the HF Group Bindery in North Manchester, Indiana for binding of periodical volumes and re-binding of monographs, and has had Heckman produce custom boxes or cases when necessary.

Library Services
As part of the University Libraries’ system, the Fine Arts Library is open to all students, faculty, alumni, and members of the local and regional communities.

The Fine Arts Library hours afford convenient access to the collections by architecture students and faculty:

**Fall and Spring Semester Schedule**
- Monday - Thursday: 8:00 am - 11:00 pm
- Friday: 8:00 am - 6:00 pm
- Saturday: 1:00 pm - 6:00 pm
- Sunday: 1:00 pm - 11:00 pm

**Summer Schedule**
- Monday-Thursday: 8:00 am - 9:00 pm
- Friday: 8:00 am - 5:00 pm
- Saturday: Closed
- Sunday: 2:00 pm - 6:00 pm

A reserve collection of fundamental references, assigned textbooks, and special readings specific to class assignments, is maintained at the Fine Arts Library Reference Desk. In addition to these materials, the Fine Arts Library also offers an E-Reserves service. Chapters from books and periodical articles are scanned and made available through the University Libraries’ course reserve module within the Libraries’ online catalog system (InfoLinks), which allows for student access to these readings 24/7. You can review this service by accessing the following url: [http://library.uark.edu/search/r](http://library.uark.edu/search/r).

Electronic access is also providing increasing amounts of information to remote users, such as distance education students or faculty working at home. Through the University Libraries’ home page (for online databases) and the links available in InfoLinks for full-text titles, users can do extensive research from off-campus locations. Please review the University Libraries’ homepage at [http://libinfo.uark.edu](http://libinfo.uark.edu).

The Fine Arts Library also maintains a website ([http://libinfo.uark.edu/fal/default.asp](http://libinfo.uark.edu/fal/default.asp)) that provides easy access to key architecture and art online research databases, as well as access to developed subject, or research guides on architecture and art topics. The Fine Arts Library offers Reference and Research Consultation services to students enrolled in the Architecture program. Students can simply stop by the Fine Arts Librarian’s office for research assistance, or they can schedule an appointment with the Librarian.
Both the University Libraries’ website and the Fine Arts Library’s website provides access to a wealth of online research databases, including the Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals, Art Full Text, WorldCat, the Bibliography of the History of Art, and many other research resources. Additional full-text resources include the Grove Dictionary of Art, with links to more than 45,000 images, JSTOR, which concentrates on providing complete back runs of core academic journals, including titles in architecture in art, and the Literature Resource Center. In addition to these electronic resources, the Fine Arts Library continues to subscribe to the Architectural Publications Index and the Architectural Index.

The Fine Arts Library offers published guides to specific research databases, including the Avery Index and WorldCat; instructions on accessing these databases are prominently displayed. Furthermore, the Fine Arts Librarian provides formal library orientations and instructions in library skills and research methods. Instructional sessions in research methods, tailored to the needs of a specific class and/or project, are also available. The Fine Arts Librarian is interested in working collaboratively with the Architecture Department faculty in order to develop an information literacy, or library research skills, program. The Fine Arts Librarian is interested in working with the architecture faculty in order to develop both learning outcomes related to library research competencies in the field of architecture, as well as an assessment program that will provide direct evidence that in fact student learning of library research skills and methodologies did in fact take place. A good starting point for a dialogue on this initiative could be for the Fine Arts Librarian and the architecture faculty to review the Architecture Research Competencies document (which is organized by those research skills students should acquire by the end of each year in their five year architecture program, which was produced by the Arts Libraries Society of North America in 2006. This initiative will also greatly contribute to the Architecture program’s emphasis on the development of and emphasis on life long learning skills.

The University Libraries Interlibrary Loan Service is exceedingly responsive. The University Libraries uses OCLC’s ILLiad software as the primary interlibrary loan transaction management package for both borrowing and lending functions. ILLiad allows our student and faculty to submit their requests via an easy to use web interface. The majority of articles and book chapters are delivered electronically usually within 24 hours, and student and faculty can view or download these items through their ILLiad accounts. The University Libraries recently purchased the RapidILL system. Participating Rapid libraries use an easy interface to request articles from each other and commit to a 24 hour turnaround time. The Libraries are members of the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA), a consortium of 31 academic libraries that commit to meeting benchmarked turnaround time standards. The University Libraries are also members of Libraries Very Interested in Sharing (LVIS), a consortium of multi-type libraries that agree to loan to each other at no charge. For more information, please see http://libinfo.uark.edu/ill/default.asp.

Several methods of communication foster awareness of library collection development. A “New Books” section is visibly located in the Fine Arts Library on a shelf opposite the reference desk. Also, on the University Libraries’ homepage, a “New Books” link is available which allows students and faculty easy access to records describing recently acquired library materials (see http://libinfo.uark.edu/acquisitions/newacqmenu.asp). Dust covers of recent acquisitions are prominently displayed in the Vol Walker lecture hall, effecting an active connection between the Fine Arts Library and a heavily used space in the architecture building. The University Libraries web page offers “What’s New
"@ Your Library," a link that provides information on pertinent information concerning database trials, new exhibitions, and related library services and activities.

Finally, since the last accreditation report, the University Libraries has developed a formal liaison service program. The Fine Arts Librarian acts as the liaison between the Architecture Department and the University Libraries. The Fine Arts Librarian works closely with the Architecture Department’s library representative, who is appointed by the Dean of the School of Architecture. Updates on Fine Arts Library collections and services are provided to the Library Representative, who in turn forwards the information to members of the architecture faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions</th>
<th>(FTE's) 2005-06</th>
<th>(FTE's) 2006-07</th>
<th>(FTE's) 2007-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarians / VR Professionals (Degreed)</td>
<td>2 FTE*</td>
<td>2 FTE*</td>
<td>2 FTE*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>3 FTE**</td>
<td>3 FTE**</td>
<td>3 FTE**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistants</td>
<td>16 PTE***</td>
<td>16 PTE***</td>
<td>16 PTE***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5 FTE</td>
<td>5 FTE</td>
<td>5 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 PTE</td>
<td>16 PTE</td>
<td>16 PTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fine Arts Library Staff**

The Fine Arts Library is a branch of the University Libraries and its staff reports to the Dean of the University Libraries. The staff consists of a full-time librarian, Associate Professor Margaret Boylan, who holds a Masters in Library Science degree along with a graduate degree in Renaissance Art History (Florence Fellow, Syracuse University), and a Masters of Fine Arts Degree in Ceramics. Ms. Boylan’s art history research, which was executed in Florence, Italy, focused on the decorative complex of the courtyard of the Palazzo Vecchio. In addition to the Fine Arts Librarian, there is a full-time day Library Supervisor, and a full-time Evening Library Supervisor, along with approximately 11-12 work study student workers. The Fine Arts Librarian’s position is a tenured faculty appointment within the University Libraries. The Library Supervisor, a classified staff position, acts as the circulation supervisor as well as training and supervising all student workers; minimum requirements for this position include a bachelor’s degree plus two years library experience. The evening supervisor position not only acts as night supervisor, but also oversees the Fine Arts Library’s Course Reserves operations. Written job descriptions exist for all positions. During the fall and spring semesters, student workers contribute approximately 110 hours per week to the library. Opportunities for professional development for the library staff have been available in the past and should continue. These have included conference attendance, workshop, or continuing education opportunities for both professional and support staff. Library salaries for both professional and support staff are commensurate with those of others within this institution.

*1 Librarian in the Fine Arts Library, 1 VR Professional in the Murray Smart Media Center
**2 paraprofessionals in the Fine Arts Library, one paraprofessional in the Murray Smart Media Center
Facilities
Located in the Fine Arts Complex less than a five-minute walk from Vol Walker Hall, the Fine Arts Library is conveniently located for student and faculty research, browsing, and instruction. The library occupies approximately 3,460 square feet of space and has 2,845 linear feet of shelving. In light of the administrative structure of the library and the spatial constraints presented by Vol Walker Hall, this is a satisfactory, if not ideal, location. Architecture benefits substantially from the close proximity of the adjacent Mullins Library, enlarged through the addition of a new wing, including expanded “service” areas for electronic information, in 1996. The addition to Mullins facilitated the removal of parts of the music collection from the Fine Arts Library, allowing some expansion and growth for open stacks for the architecture collections, but leaving only art and architecture materials in Fine Arts. Some serials have been placed in the remote storage; remote stack deliveries are made twice daily. The Fine Arts Library has one photocopier, one flat bed scanner, and four pc workstations for student use. (The staff has four networked computers; one for materials circulation, one for the Librarian, and two for other staff use.) The Fine Arts Library, last renovated in 1995, is protected by an electronic security system and a staff member is always stationed at the desk. A disaster plan has been formulated; adequate smoke detectors, fire extinguishers and climate control systems are in place.

As indicated in the “Proposal For Building And Renovation Projects For Vol Walker Hall And The Fine Arts Center Complex” (see Condition 7, Physical Resources), the Fine Arts Library has reached its capacity in its current location, and the creation of a new Fine Arts Library figures significantly in the program’s, and the library’s, plans for development of their physical resources.

Budget and Administration
Funding for the University Libraries, of which the Fine Arts Library is a branch, is through institutional allocation along with gifts, endowments, and occasional state legislature allocations. The Fine Arts Librarian plans for the branch library in conjunction with the Director of Public Services and participates fully in the working committees and the administrative duties of other department heads in Mullins Library, the main university library. The monographs budgets are allocated by discipline from within the University Libraries collections budget after serials subscriptions are encumbered. In comparison with other land-grant universities in the region, the University of Arkansas’ budget for architecture collections is lower than most.

During the summer of 2007, the University Libraries began their strategic planning process covering the next five years, which will address all aspects of future library operations, and involved all library personnel. Written goals and objectives have been established and top initiatives are currently being identified.

The Fine Arts Library operates as a full-service branch of the main University Libraries. Other branches on the campus include the Physics Library, the Chemistry Library, and the Law Library which is administered by the School of Law. The University Libraries cooperative informally with other libraries in the community through referring of patrons to the Fayetteville Public Library, or other appropriate libraries. The University Libraries is a member of the prestigious Center for Research Libraries, and is a member of University of Arkansas System Libraries, and several other regional and national library consortia. The University Libraries licenses approximately 300 research databases, holds approximately
University Libraries staff and School of Architecture faculty and students agree that the Fine Arts Library operates very well, with good and cordial relations well established between the Fine arts Library and its patrons in the School of Architecture as well as between the Fine Arts Librarian and the administration and staff of the main library.

The school and university community directly relates the success of all planning and development for the Fine Arts Library to active participation. The Library Representative regularly updates the faculty concerning appropriations, and actively solicits input and requests for acquisitions. At the university level, the University Library Committee has been instrumental in influencing the library’s strategic planning process relative to teaching and research.

THE C. MURRAY SMART MEDIA CENTER

The media center is managed by a full-time Visual Resources Curator, who directs collection acquisition, development and cataloguing, and oversees digitization of materials for academic use. A full-time staff assistant provides support for these activities as well as overseeing operation and maintenance of audio-visual equipment for the School. Part-time student assistants facilitate daily operations during the fall and spring semesters.

Collections

The Media Center houses the digital, video and slide collections of the School of Architecture and provides audio-visual support for its programs. The School’s faculty and staff have access to more than 31,000 digital images, 80,000 slides and almost 1000 video programs; faculty in allied disciplines also may use the collection. The three collections cover the evolution of the built and natural environment from pre-history to the present, including historic and contemporary architecture, landscape architecture, and urbanism. Both western and global cultures are well represented. Special collections support teaching in discrete disciplinary areas including, for example, architectural technology and structures, historic preservation, and vernacular architecture. Annual acquisitions average 5,000 digital images and 50 videos per year; circulation statistics for academic year 2006-07 totaled over 8,000 digital images, 2500 slides and 50 videos.

Data for approximately 85,000 images is catalogued in a relational database. The following information is recorded (when known) for each image: architect (or artists); name of building (or work of art); date, location; building type; source of slide; iconography (for artworks); medium, dates and nationality of architect or artist. The database software (Access) is capable of searching and creating reports on any combination of data. Data on new images is automatically entered as they are accessioned. All video programs have also been catalogued in a database that is searchable on indexing similar to that of the image collection.

Services

The main objective of the media center is to support classroom teaching, and to facilitate student and faculty research. Although slides are still used by some faculty, digital images have become the media of choice. In the summer of 2005, the Smart Media Center established a new digital image database collection; that fall the first class, an architectural survey course for non-majors, was taught entirely using this
resource. Our digital image collection currently numbers almost 32,000 data searchable images; 16,000 of these came from the Archivision archival collection which covers a wide range of significant international architectural landmarks. The software supporting this collection is the Madison Digital Image Database (MDID), created at James Madison University and offered as an open source application. This program not only delivers images but also offers an excellent tool for web delivery of “slideshows” to the classroom. The Smart Media Center houses three film scanning stations for acquiring digital images from our existing slide collection. A 35mm digital SLR camera and flatbed scanner are used to capture images from print materials; many additional original images are donated by faculty from their personal collections.

Each classroom contains technology for presenting DVD, VHS, slides and online educational material. A separate facility, a simple studio for photography of student work, is administered by the Media Center. Students are invited to use this facility to photograph their models and drawings for their portfolios. Staff assistance is available to support these activities, and orientations to the Media Center are often included in the first-year studio curriculum. Several digital cameras are available for student use. The media center also routinely video records the School’s guest lecture series and provides photographic support for the school’s public relations officer.

**Staff**

The professional staff of the Media Center consists of a full-time director and a full-time assistant director. Media Center Director Christine Hilker holds Bachelor of Arts (history) and Master of Education (Instructional Resources) degrees and has taken additional hours of coursework in architectural history, photography and management of digital collections. Ms. Hilker, an active member of the Visual Resources Association (VRA) since 1982, has a distinguished record of service including: a term as treasurer from 1991-92; another term as public relations and communications officer from 2003-2006; serving as chair of several VRA committees; and establishing and managing the VRA listserv 1991-2003. She is also active in the Southeast College Art Conference, and has assumed a leadership role in its Visual Resources Curators group. Assistant director, John Hickey, has a Bachelor of Arts (art) degree and brings previous experience in teaching, digital photography and audio systems. They are assisted by student workers, many of whom are enrolled in the School of Architecture.
### Library Collection Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Collections</th>
<th>Number of Volumes or Linear Feet</th>
<th>Budget 2005-06</th>
<th>Budget 2006-07</th>
<th>Budget 2007-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books classed in LC-NA or Dewey 720's (^{10})</td>
<td>10,587</td>
<td>$16,218</td>
<td>$4,300 (^{11})</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Books</td>
<td>3,400*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodical Subscriptions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$6,221</td>
<td>$6,887</td>
<td>$7,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Serial Subscriptions</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm Reels</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfiche</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$430</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROMs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo CDs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Image Files</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$8,200 (^{12})</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Electronic Publications</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$6,000 (^{13})</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>127,134</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,439</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,987</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,235</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**The Architecture Digital Design: Studios, Laboratories, Curriculum**

\(^{10}\) This reflects the total number of books and bound periodical volumes in both the Fine Arts Library and the University Libraries' main academic library, Mullins Library. A breakdown by location is 10,587 in the departmental library and 3,400 in Mullins Library.

\(^{11}\) Historically, the University Libraries allocates approximately $9,000 for firm ordering of books on architecture topics each year. However, in the 2006-07 fiscal year, the University Libraries had to suspend the acquisition of books in all subject areas altogether due to the exorbitant price increases that are being set by publishers of periodical/serial publications in primarily the sciences, technologies, and medical subject areas.

\(^{12}\) Includes purchase of Archivision digital collection $6,500.

\(^{13}\) This amount reflects the annual subscription fees for 2 of the online research databases that are most heavily used by students and faculty in the architecture program, which are the Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals, and the Bibliography of the History of Art.
Technology in the School of Architecture

Information technologies have come to play a central role in architectural education just as they have in professional practice and in the wider culture at large. Rapid advances in this field have presented the school with both opportunities and challenges. The school requires that all students purchase and maintain a computer for their use at the start of their second year in the professional degree program. In addition, the students are required to purchase drafting, modeling, graphic layout, image processing and structural analysis software for use in their coursework. The school encourages and requires that the students take responsibility for the selection, maintenance and upgrading of their computer systems, though technical staff in the school are available to assist them. Many students purchase scanners, color printers and digital cameras to complement the required hardware and software. The school works with the university’s computer store to provide software licenses and computers at competitive educational rates. Information specific to architecture students is available on the store’s website at the beginning of each semester and over the summer.

Software is learned in the context of the studio and technology courses as tutorials related to specific projects rather than as the subject of specialized software classes. Computer courses are available from local community colleges, high schools, and in other departments on campus. Non-credit tutorials are offered through the university’s Computing Services group. Digital technologies courses offered in the school are advanced professional electives and require the critical engagement of design, technology and theory.

All studios for second through fifth year students have network access and power at each desk. Students also have access to high-end graphical modeling software in the computer lab. The lab also provides students with scanners, plotters, large format color and B & W laser printers. In 2007 the school upgraded to a more powerful server with increased storage capacity. This allows a wider range of network based software and storage space for all studio sections to use for shared documentation. The computer lab is staffed by a full-time technical support person and is open 24/7.

The widespread use of computers in the program has required substantial investments in power and network infrastructure throughout the studios. In 2006, the building’s network wiring was upgraded and extended to a new studio space on the third floor building addition. During the building renovation digital video projectors, overhead projectors and podium workstations were added to all classrooms and the primary lecture hall. A mobile digital white board is also available to faculty for laboratory teaching purposes.

Advanced Visualization Laboratory (VIZ Lab) in the School of Architecture

The School of Architecture continues to receive funds annually for the Advanced Visualization Laboratory as committed by the university’s “New initiatives” competitive grant program [awarded in 1998]. The VIZ Lab offers students an understanding of CADCAM practices and access to three-dimensional input and output devices. The goal of the lab is two-fold. First it is intended to foster a transition from thinking and designing in two dimensions (the design on paper model) to developing the project in three dimensions through both digital and physical models. It is also intended to give the student direct experience with prototyping and manufacturing techniques that increasingly characterize design development and production in construction. The VIZ Lab houses a large format three axis CNC milling machine capable of milling foams, plastics, wood and soft metals in sizes up to 5’ x 10’ x 6 inches deep. Two laser cutters
allow plastics, wood and papers 2D to be cut and engraved up to .25” deep. These were added to the VIZ Lab in 2003 and 2005 and required significant upgrades to the building itself to accommodate ventilation requirements for these and future additions. A third laser cutter with more powerful cutting lenses is planned for this academic year.

Presently the school is reviewing the relative merits of a 3D printer and a three dimensional scanning device. At this time it is felt that a 3D scanner will better advance the lab by enabling physical objects to be easily imported into the computer models, digitally modified, and re-manufactured. The effort here is to close the loop so that an iterative and fluid design process can be developed; one that does not privilege the visual over a direct experience that engages of all the senses. The VIZ Lab is located adjacent to the wood shop to facilitate its integration with more traditional methods of construction. The metal shaping capabilities of the machine are complimented by corresponding tools in the shop that cut, break and cutting weld metals of various thickness. Both the VIZ Lab and the woodshop are open and staffed with technical assistants six days per week.

**Twenty First Century Chair in Communications Technology in Construction**

The School of Architecture is pursuing an investigation of the traditional design studio model as it encounters more integrated approaches to design, representation, communicating information, construction, and building lifecycles. How quickly will the design professions implement the promises of integrative practice through digital design and communications technology? How will the design studio model evolve as a result of integrated practice? Will the schools lead or follow in this evolution? In the next five years the school hopes to lead, through the agency of this endowed chair, an interdisciplinary team of educators, licensed practitioners, contractors and computer programmers in pursuit of rigorous, quantifiable methods for evaluating the effectiveness of curricular models and methods that address integrative digital design and communications technology within architectural education. We want to challenge, question, participate, and lead in the next evolution of architecture.

In August 2007 the school announced the appointment of Brad Workman, Vice President of Bentley Systems, Inc, as our inaugural 21st Century Chair. His role this academic year is to engage students and faculty in the discussion of architectural education in the age of integrative practice, digital design, and open share communication of information and data. He will present two public lectures, one to the School of Architecture and one to the AR state chapter of the AIA, and help the School to connect with other educators, students, and professionals interested in leading new directives in architectural education. This fall he will conduct a three-part series of faculty seminars designed to bring us his perspective, as an architect and leading software designer, on the current state of practice and to promote critical consideration of how the evolution of architectural education can impact future architects and the practices of design and construction. Brad will also lead classroom discussions with students in the Professional Practice course on the legal implications of integrative practice and BIM. In the spring he will co-teach a professional elective seminar on the ideological and practical opportunities open to architects who critically challenge the conventionally separate roles of architect, engineer, and builder.

**3.10 FINANCIAL RESOURCES**
### Department of Architecture Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$966,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (see below for detail)</td>
<td>$315,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome / Mexico City Programs</td>
<td>$253,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeleFees</td>
<td>$83,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,619,099</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Endowments

- General Endowments (includes University Endowments): $3,374,666
- Endowed Scholarships: $1,747,281
- **Total**: $5,121,647

### Non-Endowed Scholarships

- **Total**: $84,882

### Department Maintenance Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Office Supplies</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Recruitment</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Critics and Guest Lecturers</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Service and Postage</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing (Hardware $5000, Software $2500)</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Equipment Charges and Long Distance</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Services</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (Department Head - $6000, Faculty - $18,000)</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Review Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition Supplies and Publications</td>
<td>$1,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office Equipment Repair</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIAS Funding (Publication $1000, Travel $1500)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,785</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discretionary Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Series (Unfunded Entertainment)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Review Guest Honorariums</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Review Barbeque</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Forum Guests</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Development Consultation</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$14,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration and Fees</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Tech Salary</td>
<td>$13,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research Funds

- Tenured Faculty Research: $16,500
- Tenure Track Faculty Research: $16,000
- **Total**: $165,315

### Visualization Lab

- **Total**: $32,000

**TOTAL**: $7,173,228
Development Activities:
The School of Architecture has a comprehensive development plan that involves professional staff as well as alumni volunteers. Various groups meet and activities are held each year to strategize and build the program.

Campaign Committee:
The University of Arkansas' eight year Campaign for the Twenty First Century concluded June 30, 2005. The School of Architecture’s goal in the campaign was $10 million and our final amount raised was over $20 million. A thirteen member Campaign Committee assisted and was instrumental in achieving this goal. The Committee Members were located around the country and came to campus twice a year for strategy meetings. Funds raised during the Campaign were primarily for endowment, scholarships, faculty support and facilities.

Dean’s Circle:
The Dean’s Circle was created in 1996 to build financial support for the school. Initially, twenty-five members are asked to serve three-year terms, which includes a $1,000 a year donation. The pool of money that is generated each year is used exclusively for major gift fund raising, alumni gatherings, and other program and events that encourage financial support from our graduates and friends.

The Dean’s Circle each year nominates new members to join the organization. We have doubled our membership in the last five years and rarely do members drop off once they have joined the organization.

At this time we have fifty members from across the country many of which are architects or in related supporting industries. Each year the group gets together to learn more about the school and to hear of our funding challenges. Individuals in this group have been instrumental in helping the School of Architecture locate potential funding sources for scholarships and programs. Two years ago the organization determined that they wanted to set up scholarships to help with diversity recruitment. We have given out approximately $15,000 toward that effort to date.

Advisory Board Development Committee:
In the past the Professional Advisory Board has had a committee that focused on development issues. Out of this group other programs and support have been created such as the Dean’s Circle and the International Event. At the present time, the ad hoc committee is focusing their efforts on obtaining support from the construction and engineering industries. They are researching potential collaborations and funding opportunities with these related industries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC UNIT</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th># STUDENTS</th>
<th>AVE. $ / STUDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law (graduate only)</td>
<td>$5,142,723</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>$15,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech. Engineering</td>
<td>$1,493,283</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>$6,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>$1,331,757</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$6,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem. Engineering</td>
<td>$1,583,983</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$5,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>$1,517,216</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$5,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indust. Engineering</td>
<td>$1,441,100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$4,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting Events:
Each year the dean and development director host an average of three alumni events in selected cities with the goal of updating our graduates on faculty and students, programs, and development issues. We have found this a good time to reconnect with a broad group of alumni who are interested in the School of Architecture and willing to support us on many levels. We also host an event at the National A.I.A. meeting each May and have approximately 75 people in attendance.

Staff:
There is one full time Director of Development who is charged with major gift identification and solicitation. She is on the road approximately seven days a month meeting with prospective donors and businesses. The Director of Development works very closely with the University of Arkansas Advancement Division and receives much support and training from those professionals. The Division of Advancement which includes Development, University Relations, the Arkansas Alumni Association, and Special Events, works very closely with the School of Architecture to ensure our events, printed materials, and programs reflect the highest quality. Additionally, many events are held each year that our staff and donors are involved in, and we work closely to ensure that all are included and made to feel an integral part of the university.

3.11 ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION:
The University of Arkansas is accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

The School of Architecture is one of eleven schools and colleges on the University of Arkansas/ Fayetteville campus. Each school or college, including the School of Architecture, is led by a Dean. The Department of Architecture is administered by the Department Head, with one department secretary in direct support. In addition, the Department shares the following School staff with the Department of Landscape Architecture:

1. DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT;
2. DIRECTOR OF ADVISING AND ASSISTANT;
3. DIRECTOR OF THE SMART MEDIA CENTER AND STAFF;
4. DIRECTOR OF THE VISUALIZATION LAB;
5. DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS AND
6. DIRECTOR OF BUDGETS.

The Department of Architecture is led by the department head, who reports directly to the dean. The department head directs both the day-to-day affairs and the long-range planning activities of the department, hires and supervises all departmental faculty and staff, makes teaching and committee assignments, conducts annual evaluations of departmental faculty based on peer review assessments and criteria specified in the Departmental Personnel Document and distributes annual merit pay raises. In addition, the head develops and manages the department’s annual budget and engages in some private fund-raising activities. The current head also teaches virtually every semester and on occasion teaches a full course load.
ADDITIONAL UNITS OF THE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE:
The School of Architecture is comprised of five units. In addition to the school administrative and support offices under the dean and the degree granting Departments of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, the school manages Garvan Woodland Gardens in Hot Springs, Arkansas which maintains a close association with Landscape Architecture and the University of Arkansas Community Design Center, located in downtown Fayetteville, offers a design studio each semester and has its closest ties to architecture.

The university’s Division of Continuing Education assists the Department of Architecture in administering our summer program in Mexico City and our summer program for high school students on the Fayetteville campus, when offered.

The Department of Architecture is led by the department head, who reports directly to the dean of the school. The department head directs both the day-to-day affairs and the long-range planning activities of the department, hires and supervises all departmental faculty and staff, makes teaching and committee assignments, conducts annual evaluations of departmental faculty based on peer review assessments and criteria specified in the Departmental Personnel Document and distributes annual merit pay raises. In addition, the Head develops and manages the department’s annual budget and engages in private fund-raising activities.

(See Appendix H, organizational chart)
3.12 PROFESSIONAL DEGREES AND CURRICULUM

Specification Of The Degree Offered:
The Department of Architecture at the University of Arkansas offers an undergraduate baccalaureate program leading to the Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch.) degree. Students who follow the model curriculum described in the university catalog and published in the School of Architecture Orientation Guide and Planner complete degree requirements in five years.

Distribution of General Education Studies, Professional Studies and Elective Studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Minimum Core</th>
<th>General Ed. Required + Electives</th>
<th>Professional Required Core</th>
<th>Professional Options and Electives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years One, Two and Three</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Core</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Core</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tech</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 hours</td>
<td>History/Theory</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Hours First Three Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Four and Five</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Electives12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comp Studio</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior English</td>
<td>(3)*</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (15 hours)</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 (50 hours)</td>
<td>Rome/Mexico</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78 hours</td>
<td>Options Studios</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Electives</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above reveals the numerical and proportional consequences of our efforts to balance professional and liberal education as well as required studies and elective options:

1. General Education and Free Electives: \( \frac{47}{157} = 30\% \)
2. Professional Courses: \( \frac{110}{157} = 70\% \)
3. Design Studies: \( \frac{58}{157} = 37\% \)
4. Gen’l Ed Electives: \( \frac{27}{157} = 17\% \)
5. Total Required Courses: \( \frac{97}{157} = 62\% \)
6. Total Elective Courses: \( \frac{60}{157} = 38\% \)
OUTLINE OF THE CURRICULUM SHOWING THE DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL EDUCATION STUDIES, PROFESSIONAL STUDIES, AND ELECTIVE STUDIES:
The B.Arch curriculum is designed to meet NAAB requirements for a proper balance between professional studies, general studies and electives. We share the NAAB conviction that “a professional degree must allow students to pursue their special interests” and that the curriculum “must have sufficient flexibility so that students can complete minors or develop areas of concentration, either within or outside the program.”

Bachelor of Architecture Degree Requirements: 157 Credit Hours Total
1. Completion of the following 95-hour professional program (60.5% of semester hours required for the degree):
   - Architectural Design: 
     - ARCH 1014, 1024, 2016, 2026
     - ARCH 3016, 3026, 4016, 4026, 5016, and 5026
   - Architectural Technology:
     - ARCH 2114, 2124, 3134, 4154, 5163
   - History and Theory of Architecture:
     - ARCH 1212, 1222, ARCH 2233, 2243, 4433, and 4523
   - Professional Practice: ARCH 5314

2. Completion of the 35-hour general University Core as listed in the University Catalog of Studies. In addition, specific requirements are listed below:
   - Mathematics: MATH 2043 or 2053
   - Laboratory Science: PHYS 1044/1040L or PHYS 2013/2011L is required. PHYS 1054/1050L or PHYS 2033/2031L is strongly recommended.
   - English: ENGL 1013, 1023
   - American History or Government: HIST 2003 or HIST 2013 or PLSC 2003
   - Humanities and Fine Arts: 6
   - Social Sciences: 9

3. Completion of 27 hours of electives, as follows below
   - Professional Electives: Chosen from upper-level courses (courses numbered 3000 or above) taught on the Fayetteville campus of the School of Architecture. Students participating in the Rome program may present only three hours for professional elective credit.
   - Free Electives:

4. Completion of a minimum of 157 hours with a 2.00 cumulative grade-point average at this institution both in all work attempted and in all professional course work attempted is required.

5. Completion of the University Advanced Composition requirement either by course work or exemption by UA English grades or by CLEP exam.
6. Participation for at least one semester in an approved educational experience in a major international urban center.

NOTE: The hours of any required course from which a student has been exempted will be added to the free elective requirement. No more than four hours of physical education and/or R.O.T.C. may be counted toward a degree. Courses not acceptable toward degree credit include those of a remedial or orientation nature and whose content is considered to be measurably duplicated elsewhere in the curriculum. ENGL 2003 is not counted toward degree credit, nor is ARCH 1003 for Architecture majors.

**General Education Requirements with Recommended Courses for Students in Architecture:**

- **English 6 hours:**
  - ENGL 1013, Composition I; ENGL 1023, Composition II

- **Mathematics:** 3 hours
  - Architecture Students Must Elect:
    - MATH 2043, Survey of Calculus or MATH 2053, Finite Math

- **Laboratory Science:** 8 hours
  - Architecture Students Must Elect:
    - PHYS 1044/1040L, Physics for Architects I or PHYS 2013/2011L, College Physics
    - PHYS 1054/1050L, Physics for Architects II or PHYS 2033/2031L, College Physics

  Students cannot elect other science core courses without the permission of their academic advisor.

- **U.S. History or Government:** 3 hours
  - HIST 2003, History of the American People to 1877, or HIST 2013 History of the American People, 1877 to Present, or PLSC 2003, American National Government

  **Recommendation:**
  - Students with a special interest in community and government advocacy for environmental, architectural, and planning issues are encouraged to elect PLSC 2003.

- **Fine Arts and Humanities:**
  - 6 hours - Select 3 hours from each of the categories
  - **a. Fine Arts:**
    - ARHS 1003, Art Lecture
    - ARTS 1003, Art Studio
    - COMM 1003, Film Lecture
    - DANC 1003, Basic Movement and Dance
    - DRAM 1003, Theater Lecture
    - HUMN 1003, Introduction to Arts and Aesthetics
    - LARC 1003, Landscape Architecture Lecture
    - MLIT 1003, Music Lecture
Recommendations:
Students who are placed in the spring/summer Architecture Design studio are encouraged to take ARTS 1003 in the fall of first year. ARHS 1003 and HUMN 1003 will provide excellent background for required courses in the history of architecture.

b. Humanities:
   PHIL 2003, Intro to Philosophy
   PHIL 2103, Intro to Ethics
   PHIL 2203, Logic
   PHIL 3103, Ethics and the Professions
   CLST 1003, Intro Class. Studies: Greece
   CLST 1013, Intro Class Studies: Rome
   HUMN 2124H, Century Global Culture
   HUMN 1124H, Equilibrium of Cultures, 500 to 1600
   WLIT 1113, World Lit I
   WLIT 1123, World Lit II
   Any Foreign Language 2003 level +
   HUMN 2003, Intro to Gender Studies

Recommendations:
CLST 1003, CLST 1013, HUMN 1114H, and HUMN 1124 are particularly relevant to the professional curriculum.

Architecture students planning to participate in the School of Architecture’s Rome and/or Mexico programs should consider developing skills in Italian and/or Spanish.

Social Sciences:
9 hours: Select from at least two different fields of study.

   AGEC 1103, Intro to Agri Economics
   AGEC 2103, Prin of Agri Economics
   ANTH 1023, Intro to Cultural Anthropology
   ECON 2013, Prin of Macroeconomics
   ECON 2023, Prin of Microeconomic
   ECON 2143, Basic Economics
   GEOG 1123, Human Geography
   GEOG 2023, Economic Geography
   GEOG 2203, Developing Nations
   HESC 1403, Life Span Development
   HESC 2413, Family Relations
   HIST 1003, Western Civilization I
   HIST 1013, Western Civilization II
   HIST 1113, World Civilization I
   HIST 1123, World Civilization II
   HIST 2003, History of Amer. People to 1877
   HIST 2013, History of Amer. People 1877 to Present
   HUMN 1114H, Roots of Culture to 5000 C.E.
   HUMN 2114H, Birth of Modern Culture
   PLSC 2003, American National Government
   PLSC 2013 Intro to Political Science
PLSC 2203, State & Local Government  
PSYC 2003, General Psychology  
RSOC 2603, Rural Sociology  
SOCI 2013, General Sociology  
SOCI 2033, Social Problems

RecommenDations:  
HIST 2003, HIST 2013, and PLSC 2003 cannot be used to fulfill both the social science requirement and the U.S. History requirements.

Students interested in business management as an aspect of architectural and landscape architectural practice should consider ECON 2013, ECON 2023, ECON 2143.

Students interested in the human factors that influence design should consider ANTH 1023, GEOG 1123, GEOG 2203, PSYC 2003, SOCI 2013, and SOCI 2033. All designers should have some appreciation for this area of knowledge.

Students interested in the historical factors that influence design should consider HIST 1003 and HIST 1013.

Students interested in community planning should consider PLSC 2203 and RSOC 2603.

First Year Sample Curriculum:  
First Year Pre-Professional Program for Students in Fall-Spring Design Studio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 1014</td>
<td>Architectural Design I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 1212</td>
<td>Design Methods I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 303V</td>
<td>Leadership by Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL1013</td>
<td>English Composition I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 2003 or 2013, or PLSC 2003,</td>
<td>American History</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 1044/1040L</td>
<td>Physics for Architects I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Semester Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 1024</td>
<td>Architectural Design II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 1222</td>
<td>Design Methods II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 303</td>
<td>Leadership by Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1023</td>
<td>English Composition II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 2043</td>
<td>Survey of Calculus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or MATH 2053</td>
<td>Finite Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 1054/1050L</td>
<td>Physics for Architects II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Semester Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# First Year Pre-Professional Program for Students in Spring-Summer Design Studio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL1013</td>
<td>English Composition I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 2003 or 2013, or PLSC 2003, MATH 2043 or MATH 2053</td>
<td>American History, Survey of Calculus, Finite Math</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 1044/1040L</td>
<td>Physics for Architects I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 303V</td>
<td>Leadership by Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Fine Arts/Humanities Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Semester Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fall

- ARCH 1014: Architectural Design I
- ARCH 1222: Design Methods II
- ARCH 303V: Leadership by Design
- ENGL 1023: English Composition II
- PHYS 1054/1050L: Physics for Architects II
- CORE ELECTIVE: Fine Arts/Humanities Core Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 2016</td>
<td>Architectural Design III</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 2114</td>
<td>Architectural Technology I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 2233</td>
<td>History of Architecture I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Social Science core requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Semester Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Spring

- ARCH 2026: Architectural Design IV
- ARCH 2124: Architectural Technology II
- ARCH 2243: History of Architecture II
- CORE ELECTIVE: Social Science core requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Semester Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summer Session 1

- ARCH 1221: Design Methods II
- ARCH 1024: Architectural Design II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Semester Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** PHYS 1044/1040L, PHYS 1054/1050L (or an approved alternate laboratory science in the University Core) and MATH 2043 or MATH 2053 must be completed before students can begin second-year courses in Architecture.

# Second Year Sample Curriculum:

## Fall

- ARCH 2016: Architectural Design III
- ARCH 2114: Architectural Technology I
- ARCH 2233: History of Architecture I
- CORE ELECTIVE: Social Science core requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Semester Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Spring

- ARCH 2026: Architectural Design IV
- ARCH 2124: Architectural Technology II
- ARCH 2243: History of Architecture II
- CORE ELECTIVE: Social Science core requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Semester Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Third Year Sample Curriculum:

**Fall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 3016</td>
<td>Architectural Design V</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 3134</td>
<td>Architectural Technology III</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4433</td>
<td>History of Architecture III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Fine/Arts /Humanities core requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Students in the spring/summer studio will have completed this requirement)

**Total Semester Hours** 16

**Spring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 3026</td>
<td>Architectural Design VI</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4523</td>
<td>Architectural Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Fine/Arts /Humanities core requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Students in the spring/summer studio will have completed this requirement)

**Total Semester Hours** 15

Note: All University Core courses must be completed by the end of third year. Admission to ARCH 4016 is contingent upon admission to the Professional Program.

### Fourth Year Sample Curriculum:

**Fourth Year Professional Program for Students in Rome, Fall Semester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4016</td>
<td>Architectural Design VII (Rome)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4023</td>
<td>Italian Seminar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4023</td>
<td>Art and Culture of Italy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4023</td>
<td>Architecture of the City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Semester Hours** 15

**Spring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4026</td>
<td>Architectural Design VIII (Option)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4154</td>
<td>Architectural Technology V</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Professional Elective to be selected</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Free Elective to be selected</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Semester Hours** 16

**Fourth Year Professional Program for Students in Rome, Spring Semester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4016</td>
<td>Architectural Design VII (Option)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4154</td>
<td>Architectural Technology V</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Professional Elective to be selected</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Free Elective to be selected</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Semester Hours** 16
### Fourth Year Professional Program for Students in Mexico the Following Summer

**Fall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4016</td>
<td>Architectural Design VII (Option)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4154</td>
<td>Architectural Technology V</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Professional Elective to be selected</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Free Elective to be selected</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Semester Hours**: 16

**Spring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 4026</td>
<td>Architectural Design VIII (Option)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Professional Elective to be selected</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVES</td>
<td>Elective to be selected</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Semester Hours**: 15

### Fifth Year Sample Curriculum:

#### Fifth Year Professional Program for Rome Students

**Fall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 5016</td>
<td>Architectural Design IX (Comp Studio)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 5163</td>
<td>Architectural Technology VI</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 5314</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Professional Elective to be selected</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Semester Hours**: 16

**Spring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 5026</td>
<td>Architectural Design X (Option)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Semester Hours**: 6

#### Fifth Year Professional Program For Students In The Mexico Program

**Summer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 5016</td>
<td>Architectural Design X (Mexico)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF ELECTIVE</td>
<td>Professional Elective when offered</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Semester Hours**: 6-9

**Fall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 5016</td>
<td>Architectural Design IX (Comp Studio)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 5163</td>
<td>Architectural Technology VI</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARCH 5314  Professional Practice  4  
PROF ELECTIVE  Professional Elective to be selected  3  

Total Semester Hours:  16  

Spring  
PROF ELECTIVE  Professional Electives to be selected  6  
FREE ELECTIVE  Free Elective to be selected  3  

Total Semester Hours:  9  

Note: Students wishing to graduate in December following the summer in Mexico may adjust their course loads accordingly to fulfill elective requirements normally completed in the spring of the fifth year.

MINORS AND CONCENTRATIONS:  
One important aspect of our last major curriculum revision was the designation of as many as 60 semester hours that could, in varying degrees and different ways, be seen as electives. This includes free electives, professional electives, and, with consent and the close scrutiny of departmental academic advisors, possible self-directed design studio work in three of a student’s last four semesters. This was intended to provide an alternative to conventional design studios, particularly for students with a strong interest in architecture and practice who may have been in danger of becoming demoralized because they do not perceive themselves as “designers” or because they wished to pursue an alternative career path in lieu of traditional practice. This curricular structure affords opportunities for students to elect classes in other colleges, including the pursuit of established minors offered by the Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Engineering, or the Walton College of Business, or of a concentration in a sub-disciplinary specialization within the School of Architecture.

Minors in Other Colleges  
Since the last accreditation visit, there has been a visible increase in the number of architecture students who, through judicious distribution of both university (general education) core and free elective hours, pursue minors outside the School of Architecture. Requirements for academic minors are determined by individual departments, and range from 15 hours (Religious Studies, for example) to 21 hours (Business, for example). Recently, students have completed, or are currently working toward fulfilling the requirements for academic minors in a variety of areas including Art, Art History, Spanish, English, Classical Studies, General Business, Geography and Religious Studies. 65 students since 2002 have pursued minors outside of the School of Architecture.

Major and Minor Concentrations in the School of Architecture  
In fall 2001, the Department of Architecture introduced a structure for students to declare a minor concentration (at least 18 semester hours of elective course work) or a major concentration (at least 33 hours of elective course work and option studios) in sub-disciplinary areas of inquiry in which the program, together with allied disciplines on campus, offer demonstrated strengths. Minor concentrations offer students preparing for traditional practice opportunities to focus a combination of professional and free elective courses on an area of study in which the student has a particular interest or aptitude; major concentrations, which also may involve the production of a thesis, allow students to pursue intensive, upper level investigation of an area of study. The major concentration is suited particularly to students preparing for post-professional education.
We will continue to work within the structure of our existing curriculum to provide the best possible opportunities for all students based on their wide-ranging interests.

1. **Requirements For A Major Concentration In The History Of Architecture / Urbanism:**
   The major concentration in the History of Architecture and Urbanism requires at least 33 semester hours, and must include the following:
   1. Completion of requirements for admission to the professional program in architecture, including ARCH 2233, 2243 and 4433, and presentation of a 3.25 grade point average.
   2. At least nine hours of 4000-level professional electives in the School of Architecture.
   3. At least three hours in the History of Architecture and Urbanism Colloquium.
   4. At least twelve hours of free electives to be selected from the following areas, upper-level (3000+) art history, humanities, social sciences, or foreign languages.
   5. At least six hours of research thesis (ARCH 5026, option studio); students pursuing the historic preservation emphasis are strongly encouraged to participate in the UACDC option studio (ARCH 4016 or 4026).

2. **Requirements For A Minor Concentration In The History Of Architecture / Urbanism:**
   The minor concentration in the History of Architecture and Urbanism requires at least 18 semester hours, and must include the following:
   1. Completion of requirements for admission to the professional program in architecture, including ARCH 2233, 2243, and 4433.
   2. At least nine hours of professional electives in any area of architectural and urban history, selected from the following and other approved courses.
   3. At least three hours in the History of Architecture and Urbanism Colloquium.
   4. At least six hours in humanities and/or social science courses related to the minor.
   5. The research thesis (ARCH 5026, option studio) is optional for students in the minor; students interested in an historic preservation emphasis are strongly encouraged to participate in the UACDC option studio (ARCH 4016 or 4026).
3.13 STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

CURRICULUM SYNOPSIS:

Overview
We are motivated to administer a program and construct a curriculum preparing all students for their future divergent endeavors. We are intent on providing a framework for the academic success of all motivated students. Learning to negotiate the complexities of design, through the inventive application of a wide range of knowledge, prepares our students for a life of learning and inquiry in service of their careers and society. Though we are a professional school primarily charged with educating students for professional practice, we aspire to much more than merely preparing students with the base professional competencies. Though we assuredly address these requirements, we educate rather than merely train. We seek to sponsor and promote inquiry and life-long learning as a conceptually based active-learning enterprise serving as a foundation for successful pursuit of the widest range of analogous endeavors, be they professional, vocational, or educational.

Studio Pedagogy
Design education is both a linear and an iterative process. The linearity involves the introduction of exercises demanding more informed, sophisticated responses to projects of increasing complexity. The maturation of the design student is evidenced in successive exercises choreographed to require the application and advancement of acquired knowledge and skills.

The issues we assume must be taught and learned in our school include:

- Principles (Values)
- Spatial legibility and manipulation (Composition)
- Building process/systems (Tectonics)
- Form/meaning/occupation (Representation)
- Representation/presentation (skills) (Communication)

Optimally these issues, inherent in an architecture of substance, will be incorporated into every studio at every year level. However, students have neither the knowledge nor the skills to confront all of these issues in a meaningful way in the early years of our curriculum. Thus the earliest years of instruction are dedicated to building a foundation focusing on organizational principles, spatial logic, and representation skills to prepare for meaningful and graduated immersion into the full range of issues in successive years of the curriculum.

As a professional architecture program, we focus on analytic and synthetic exercises involving architectural design. Architectural investigations include context (physical and social), program, and technology in varying degrees of focus. Always residing within these three circumstances are issues of form, meaning, and occupation which must be addressed to achieve comprehensiveness. All assignments within the program require, allied lectures and readings inform, and successful solutions address, the development of architectural ideas at all scales of the design endeavor, from site to space to detail.

Communication through representational skills and techniques, in parallel with verbal and/or written premises, afford students the opportunity to convey their intent in negotiating architectural issues in a meaningful, inventive manner. In the beginning years
the development of representational skills occurs through architectural investigations, not as stand-alone technique-based enterprises. This fosters the simultaneous development of design and representational skills, allowing students to gain a sense of propriety in the employment of convention and technique while addressing meaningful architectural ideas.

Our students are expected to convey not only the conceptual underpinnings of their designs, but, as has been our tradition and distinction, to also strive to represent through drawing and modeling, their aspirations for perception as a circumstance of habitation as well. Although we expect them to be significantly more skillful in the final years of the curriculum, we do not defer these issues, which include among others, materiality and light, until that time.

Our curriculum is structured and our faculty is motivated to promote the integration of history, technology, and design. We believe the most successful means of integrative learning is through the introduction of precedents and case studies in the design studio as well as in allied classes in technology, theory, and history. This strategy allows for the cross-pollination of topics, provides tangible, relevant exemplars to contextual, programmatic, and technological responses, and serves to introduce students to a wider range of applied knowledge. In short, all facets of the curriculum gain traction through the vehicle of precedent. We believe that by understanding the physical, social, and cultural context of an architectural production, our students may analogously legitimize their own designs responses, rising above the mere formalism that is sadly, often the high-water mark of a design response.

In the first years of the design curriculum ‘precedent’ is used to introduce and illustrate basic organizational logics and fundamental spatial principles. Canonical spatial types, as evidenced in the works of modern and classical ‘masters’ are used, unapologetically, as a basis for investigating architecture at the scale of the building and the city. (For example, free plan is investigated as an architectural and urban strategy.) Paralleling the students’ enrollment in the technology courses, case studies are employed to help develop critical skills in the application of building systems and materials in response to varied contextual conditions.

In the later years of the curriculum exemplars are increasingly vetted and introduced by students as well as by faculty to clarify or substantiate proposed design solutions. This reflects a willingness to recognize their place in the milieu of architectural history on the part of the student and a broad, dexterous knowledge on the part of the faculty. ‘Proofs’ through precedent require diagramming of the referenced design, not merely presenting an image, plan, or photograph. As such these precedent analyses inform projects conceptually and through the act of diagramming, are evidence that students have gained knowledge of the imbedded, parallel lessons.

**Structure**

Our program is divided into the (pre-professional) core, consisting of the first three years of the program, and the professional program, comprising the final two years of the degree. This division serves a number of purposes. Structurally, it necessitates that students complete required courses, including both the architecture and university cores, to an acceptable standard prior to their admission to the professional program. In terms of content, satisfactory completion of the core represents achievement in the knowledge of, and ability to apply basic competencies serving as a foundation for advanced design exploration within the professional program. Each student is evaluated
after completion of their third year through a professional program review, including an accounting of courses taken, as well as comparing performance in these courses to grade point standards in each of the sub-disciplines comprising the curriculum.

The Core. (1st-3rd Year)

First-Year Synopsis
While recognizing and promoting the primacy of space and the ability to conceive and compose it, we seek to advance students’ analytic and synthetic abilities in response to history, program, site, tectonics, and language. We teach architectural conventions, reinforce the important lessons found in architectural history, and seek to increase the students' inventive capacity while helping them establish a benchmark of professional responsibility. Specifically, we pursue the following objectives:

- Introduce principles of spatial organization
- Awaken an appreciation of materials and systems
- Introduce conventions of representation
- Advance visual thinking through drawing and modeling
- Introduce formal analysis as a necessary enterprise of design
- Instill a dedication to craft
- Promote the ethical responsibilities of architects to the environment and profession

The first year at the University of Arkansas only loosely follows typical models employed at other schools and is not directly attributable to Bauhaus or Beaux Arts studio models. The distinctive nature of the experience is attributable both to structure and content. No courses (at any level of our program) focus solely on hand or digital graphic representation. Rather, we coordinate a sequence of exercises focused on design, simultaneously promoting representational craft as an integral aspect of architectural exploration and discovery. This emphasis, carried out through hand-drawing, is of great importance to the distinction of our overall curriculum as it engenders in the students the necessity for patience, detail, craft, and precision in investigating ‘place’. Specifically, the distinction of our first year design exercises lies in our emphasis on surface related to spatial experience. Accordingly projects focus on the surface, addressing tectonics and materiality as revealed through light, shade, and shadow and as perceived in space. Perspective and analytiques, in addition to conventional orthographic drawing and diagramming, are used to explore the potency of material space. The ability to represent projects through highly crafted drawings, diagrams, and models provides an excellent base for future years and instills an appreciation for integrity in the representation and execution of architecture. The exercises comprising our first year, by virtue of their attention to occupation and perception, seek to build on students' knowledge rather than discounting it, giving them the tools necessary for formal, critical appraisal of the world around them and for their interventions within it. Although first year projects are of limited scope and scale, students are bound to confront issues of site, material, structure, and occupation. The intent is to promote ‘comprehensiveness’ in this and each level of the curriculum.

Allied issues are addressed in the Design Methods courses, the primary purpose of which is to introduce students to the wide range of technical, theoretical and
perceptual ideas informing architectural design and production. In addition to other University Core classes and their studio-focused endeavors, students in the first year participate in Leadership by Design, a one credit hour course intended to establish a level of personal and social responsibility, while also introducing students to the resources of the university and larger community which can enrich their learning experiences.

Second-Year Synopsis

Students entering the first-year studio in the fall and spring of the previous year come together for the first time in the first semester of second-year. All students enroll in co-requisite studio, technology, and history courses in both semesters. This simultaneous enrollment in parallel avenues of study marks the students’ full immersion into architectural study and affords faculty the opportunity to address a greater range of issues in design studios and lecture classes. Throughout the year, efforts are made to make connections between these areas of the curriculum, utilizing the studio as the crucible to investigate and synthesize knowledge through design investigations. Architecture of substance requires the integration of various ideas, skills, information, and concepts explored in a wide range of courses into a holistic design response. Accordingly we promote a comprehensive, integrative understanding of architecture in all venues of the curriculum.

Primary issues addressed in the second–year studios include:

• Spatial typology related to construction, use, and circumstance
• Site/context relationships, including physical and cultural forces
• Space/structure relationships
• Environmental response
• Material/assembly

Projects of longer duration are employed in the second-year studios allowing for a greater depth of investigation, analysis, and engagement with precedents, and building technologies.

Third-Year Synopsis

The third-year marks the final year in the core or pre-professional program. Implicit in the successful completion of this year is a preparedness for the advanced, focused design and research endeavors comprising the final two years of the program; the ‘professional program.’ Recent changes in the third-year curriculum include the elimination of Tech IV, a four-hour lecture course covering a range of topics in building technologies. In its place we have shifted the content of the second semester studio (Tech Studio, Design 6) to focus on the development of building systems and technologies, with the belief that the students gain a better understanding of these issues through inventive application than through passive learning associated with lecture courses. Additionally we have added a required course in architectural theory to address a perceived shortcoming in our curriculum. This course prepares students for the in-depth design investigations they will encounter in the professional program, enriches their intellect, and provides a venue for the synthesis of knowledge gained through parallel avenues of study.

In both semesters, studios focus on urban issues including urban morphology, dynamics, and the role of housing as a building block of the city and a societal need. Projects in the first semester address urban sprawl through engagement of the ‘big-
box’ urbanism that has come to define our urban periphery, while second semester projects focus on infill strategies in more traditional urban sites, forcing students to confront the ever-critical issue of modern architectural insertions into existing, often historic, contexts.

**Professional Program (4th-5th Year)**

**Option (Vertical) Studios**
The 7th, 8th, and 10th studios are elective to the extent that students select from a set of studios in a given semester. In the current curriculum one of the studios is dedicated to the international experience in either Rome and/or Mexico while the other(s) are selected from a range of offerings including studios offered by in-house faculty, including the UACDC, visiting faculty, including the Fay Jones and John Williams Visiting Professors, or an Honors Thesis (10th Studio only). Topics range from urban issues to architectural investigations including sustainable design, advanced building systems, and site specific interventions. (The faculty is currently considering ways to restructure the final year of the curriculum to accommodate a year-long ‘degree project’ intended to promote students’ independent thinking and demonstrated capacity for innovation and synthetic accomplishment in design.)

**Comprehensive Studio (9th Studio and Tech VI)**
The comprehensive studio engages in a set of requirements that, while not geared solely towards accreditation criteria, coincide with them in the trajectory of the semester. Through immersion in relatively short, interrelated exercises, each serving as a component of the final design presentation, students develop in-depth design proposals addressing occupation and simultaneously, building technology. The studio is purposely multivalent, forcing students to make decisions at multiple scales throughout the design process, avoiding the tendency to defer detailed decisions until late in the development of the project. The cumulative exercises and commensurate products represent a project comprehensively by conveying the experience of place achieved through in-depth spatial, sequential, material, and systemic development. The studio promotes invention over convention. Tech VI provides a forum for the introduction, application, and critique of building systems in service of, and tempering, the final design. The focus on systems and environmental response in Tech VI is intended to extend the investigation of enclosure and structure raised in the third-year tech studio. The goal of this studio, in addition to necessarily addressing accreditation criteria, is to establish for students a high standard of project investigation and development in preparation for practice. Projects generally focus on sacred spaces, necessitating that students engage in issues of light, shade, shadow, materiality, and assembly with attention to the emotive capacities of architectural space and sequence.

**Professional Electives**
In addition to the studios offered in the professional programs, students choose from a wide selection of professional electives offered by faculty within the School of Architecture, as well as from those approved as professional elective credit in other academic departments. Students may take these courses as a broad sampling of topics or may select them based on specific interests in the field in preparation for graduate study or specialized practice within the profession.
EXPECTED KNOWLEDGE/COMPETENCIES/ DESIGN STUDIO SEQUENCE RUBRIC

Cumulative ~ Comprehensive ~ Design Competencies
Student dexterity with these issues should be evident through the process and product

CORE
First Year
End of First Semester
• Drawing Fundamentals including line-weight conventions
• Sketching as a speculative enterprise
• Craft/Skill Building
• Canonical spatial types through analysis/synthesis of plan and section

End of Second Semester
• Canonical spatial types
• Inside/outside transparency
• Conditions of materiality
• Conventions of architectural orthographic representation, 2D representation
• Perspective as a synthetic and analytic tool
• Effects of light/shade/shadow through descriptive geometry
• Presentation skills and strategies (verbal/visual)

Specific Sites (Actual or Idealized) required hereafter
Second Year
End of First Semester (Type: Form/Scale relationship-2 scales)
• Synthesis of architectural space/program
• Relationships of the tectonic (structure and enclosure) to space
• Building/Site relationship (environmental/stereotomic/cultural)
• Critical application of precedent
• Diagramming as speculative enterprise
• Digital representation

End of Second Semester (Type: Live/Work, Public/Private, Infill Site/Open Site)
• Dexterity in employment of, or confrontation with, spatial types
• Critical response to context (physical) with emphasis on modern spatial strategies
• Structure/space relationships
• Writing as design speculation
• CAD standards/dexterity

PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM
Third Year
End of First Semester (Type: Housing)
• Programming as a critical design enterprise
• Architectural Urbanism (social/physical context)

End of Second Semester (Type: Form/Scale relationship-2 scales/sequences)
• Systems integration
• Dexterity of building systems employment in response to program/site/sustainability
• Diagrammatic representation of systems
• Detailing as an inventive enterprise
• Design theory

Fourth Year
International Experience (Type: Urban Types-Institutional)
• Urban analysis/architectural synthesis
• Empathy with social/historic contexts
• Field sketching/drawing skills

Vertical Studio (Type: None Specified)
• Analogous and/or focused design explorations

Fifth Year
Comprehensive Studio (Type: Sacred Space)
• Phenomenology
• Advanced systems integration
• Directed, comprehensive, design exploration

STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA
For the purpose of accreditation, graduating students must demonstrate understanding or ability in the following areas:

1. Speaking and Writing Skills
   Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

2. Critical Thinking Skills
   Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test them against relevant criteria and standards

3. Graphics Skills
   Ability to use appropriate representational media, including freehand drawing and computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process

4. Research Skills
   Ability to gather, assess, record, and apply relevant information in architectural coursework.

5. Formal Ordering Systems
   Understanding of the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design

6. Fundamental Design Skills
   Ability to use basic architectural principles in the design of buildings, interior spaces, and sites

7. Collaborative Skills
   Ability to recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team

8. Western Traditions
   Understanding of the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them

9. Non-Western Traditions
Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

10. National and Regional Traditions
Understanding of national traditions and the local regional heritage in architecture, landscape design and urban design, including the vernacular tradition

11. Use of Precedents
Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

12. Human Behavior
Understanding of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment

13. Human Diversity
Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical ability, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects

14. Accessibility
Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities

15. Sustainable Design
Understanding of the principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthful buildings and communities

16. Program Preparation
Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

17. Site Conditions
Ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project

18. Structural Systems
Understanding of principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems

19. Environmental Systems
Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope

20. Life Safety
Understanding of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress

21. Building Envelope Systems
Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building envelope materials and assemblies

22. Building Service Systems
Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems

23. Building Systems Integration
Ability to assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building
envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design

24. Building Materials and Assemblies
Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse

25. Construction Cost Control
Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

26. Technical Documentation
Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

27. Client Role in Architecture
Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and resolve the needs of the client, owner, and user

28. Comprehensive Design
Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies and the principles of sustainability

29. Architect’s Administrative Roles
Understanding of obtaining commissions and negotiating contracts, managing personnel and selecting consultants, recommending project delivery methods, and forms of service contracts

30. Architectural Practice
Understanding of the basic principles and legal aspects of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation, and mediation and arbitration as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice, such as globalization, outsourcing, project delivery, expanding practice settings, diversity, and others

31. Professional Development
Understanding of the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

32. Leadership
Understanding of the need for architects to provide leadership in the building design and construction process and on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics in their communities

33. Legal Responsibilities
Understanding of the architect’s responsibility as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, historic preservation laws, and accessibility laws

34. Ethics and Professional Judgment
Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice.